Published on the 15th of the month.

Vol. XIII., No. 5. AUGUST, 1923.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

CONTENTS

PAGE

In Memoriam:—Cyril William Emmet 217

The Right Way of Reading the Bible 220
Sir Harry Reichel, LL.D.

Lyra Apostolica 232
Alfred Fawkes, M.A.

The Need for Restatement 239
Canon Durell, B.D., C.B.E.

In the Image of God 242
Miss E. Rodgers.

The Atonement 251
Professor R. H. Kennett, D.D.

Book Reviews:—
A Protestant Confessional 263
Roads to Unity 266
Diet and Devotion 268
'La Joie de Vivre' and Education 269
For the Plain Man 270
Prayers for Boys 271

Correspondence 271

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

AGENTS: SOUTH AFRICA—T. MASKEW MILLER, Cape Town.
NEW ZEALAND—WALTER NASH, 110–112 Lambton Quay, Wellington.

Price 1/- net. Annual Subscription, 10/6.

IF YOU REQUIRE

The finest Wines, Spirits. Cigars and Tobacco,
The best quality Provisions, Groceries & Confectionery
Combined with prompt and courteous attention,
Then you will save money, trouble and time
by ordering from

GRIMBLY HUGHES & CO. LTD. THE CORNMARKET STORES, OXFORD.

Telephone "Oxford Four.

QUALITY **SERVICE**

THE MITRE HOTEL, OXFORD.

THIS well-known Hotel for Families and Gentlemen, which is situate in the centre of the finest street in Europe, close to the Colleges, and within an easy distance of the river, has been enlarged and much improved. While the traditional antiquity of the building has been carefully preserved, visitors will find in it all the refined comforts of a MODERN HOTEL. The MITRE is largely patronized by distinguished English, American, and Continental Visitors, and is recognised as one of the best first-class Hotels in the United Kingdom.

Dining, Drawing, Reading and Smoking Rooms, Lounge, Good Suites of Rooms, and Four Spacious Billiard Rooms.
Electric Light. A Night Porter in attendance.

Tariff on application to C. J. VERT, Manager. Telephone 335. Telegrams: 'Mitre,' Oxford.

HOOKHAM & COMPANY,

Clerical Outfits for Home or Colonial Wear.
Academical Robe Makers.

TAILORS, SHIRTMAKERS, HOSIERS, HATTERS.

3 CORNMARKET, OXFORD.

TAILORS SINCE 1846.

CASTELL & SON.

OUTFITTING ADDED IN 1873.

University and Clerical Tailors,
Robe Makers,
13 BROAD STREET, OXFORD.
(Opposite Balliol College).

Representatives of the Firm are frequently travelling, and appointments are respectfully solicited.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 5. AUGUST, 1923. Vol. XIII.

IN MEMORIAM

CYRIL WILLIAM EMMET

THE Modernist cause in the English Church has suffered grievous loss by the sudden death of Cyril William Emmet. Mr. Emmet sailed from England on the 4th July to preach a course of sermons at St. Bartholomew's Church, New York, and to fulfil other engagements in America. He preached his first sermon to a very large congregation with great effect on 15th July. He was taken ill on the following Tuesday, and died from pneumonia on the following Sunday morning (July 22nd).

Modernists had hoped great things from his visit to America, *sed Deo aliter visum est.* Mr. Emmet was one of the very best products of the modern critical movement in the English Church. There are some whom that movement tempts to scepticism: there are others whom it frightens into obscurantism: there are others whom it leads into closer fellowship with God and their fellow-men, for it imparts to them truer views of the Divine nature and human nature, truer views of the universe and human history, truer views of the processes of revelation and salvation. Mr. Emmet came in this third class. He had a message to deliver which, while abreast of modern historical and critical knowledge, was yet absolutely

loyal to the fundamental Christian verities. He possessed, moveover, a happy combination of courage, wisdom, and sympathy, which enabled him to say things which other men could not say without arousing alarm and opposition. He was possessed of a spirit of sweet reasonableness; he wished to conciliate opponents even when he was unable to convince them. He was exceedingly patient under criticism, and was always genuinely anxious to understand those who criticized him. There are Liberal theologians, as there are Catholic theologians, who seem to lack the Christian *ethos*: this was far from being so in Mr. Emmet's case. Yet he was equally far from being a member of the *Deep Church Party*, or a lukewarm member of all parties at once. He was a convinced Modernist, and was not afraid to be known as such.

For years he had been a hard student. A Scholar of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, he took a good degree (first class Mods., second class *Lit. Hum.*); ordained in 1898, he served in two London curacies until his college presented him to the vicarage of West Hendred in 1906. Here he remained until 1920. It was in this little country parish that he became a learned man and produced his books: *The Eschatological Question* in 1911, *Galatians* in 1912, his commentaries on the Third and Fourth Books of *Maccabees* in 1918 and 1919, and *Conscience, Creeds, and Critics*. His last published work was an able criticism in the *Church Quarterly Review* for April, 1923, of Bishop Gore's *Belief in Christ*.

When the Ripon Clergy College, which had been closed down during the war, was moved up to Oxford, and re-opened as Ripon Hall in 1919, Mr. Emmet was appointed Vice-Principal, a post which he held until his death. In 1920 he was elected a Fellow of University College, Oxford, and subsequently became Dean. As a theological tutor and lecturer in the University he showed ability of a very high order, for to his competent knowledge were united the gifts of lucidity, humour, and enthusiasm. He became select preacher before the University of Oxford in 1918-20, and of Cambridge in 1920. During the last five years of his life he entered into a stimulating literary partnership with Miss Lily Dougall and Canon Streeter. This bore fruit in his essays in the volumes

entitled *Immortality* (1918) and *The Spirit* (1919), and in his contribution to *The Lord of Thought* (1923). He also wrote articles for Dr. Hastings' numerous dictionaries and for the magazines. He was an incessant and rapid worker, and it is to be feared that it was in some measure over-work which contributed to his death at the early age of forty-eight.

With the exception of the appointment of Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Oxford in 1919, the Church authorities had not openly recognized his merits by promotion, but his friends and intimates could not but feel that with his varied gifts he was almost certain to attain a position of ecclesiastical eminence in the near future.

His death is a grave loss to those ideals for which Modernists are united. Mr. Emmet was a tower of strength at the annual Modern Churchmen's Conferences, and we shall all feel the gap he has left behind when we assemble at Girton next month. He was largely responsible for the change in the type of programme to be presented at this year's Conference, and we looked to him in no small measure to assist in making it a success in the best sense of that word.

On the news of his death memorial services were held in the chapels of Ripon Hall and University College, the latter of which was attended by the Bishop of Oxford and the Vice-Chancellor of the University. The acute sense of loss occasioned by his death has been tempered by the numerous expressions of gratitude for his useful life and uplifting influence from those to whom he ministered in various ways, and by the ready kindness of leading members of St. Bartholomew's Church, New York, to his bereaved widow, which brings closer together the Modernists of the two countries. His body, by the generosity of an American layman, was brought back to England for interment at West Hendred, where he was loved and honoured as a faithful parish priest.

H.D.A.M.

THE RIGHT WAY OF READING THE BIBLE*

By Sir HARRY REICHEL, Principal of University College, North Wales, and sometime Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford.

THE Headmaster has asked me to say something to the school in chapel, and the request of the Headmaster of one's old school is equivalent to a command. But it is no easy task he has laid on me. I have never preached a sermon before, and at my age (I was Head Grecian in 1874-5) it is difficult to turn one's hand to a new kind of work. I must beg your indulgence for inevitable shortcomings.

The subject I want to speak about is the reading of the Bible. 'Until this day,' says the Apostle, speaking of his Jewish opponents, 'Whensoever Moses is read, a veil lieth upon their hearts' (II Cor. iii, 14).

The Jews of St. Paul's day idolized the Scriptures, much as Mahommedans do the Koran. The Scriptures were divinely inspired, not merely in their general sense, but book by book, chapter by chapter, sentence by sentence, word by word, indeed almost letter by letter (for the letters were carefully counted and a mystical significance attached to the number). Yet they were unable to see their plain meaning, that they pointed to Jesus Christ whom he preached. They were so much immersed in detail that they missed the general effect. As we say, they couldn't see the wood for the trees. But this is by no means confined to the Jews. It is what always happens when exaggerated reverence is paid to the letter or text of any writer: his real meaning is almost certain to be lost. Exactly the same development took place in the Christian Church. Greater and greater reverence was paid, as the years went on, to the collection of sacred books (the Bible or Book as it came to be called), which now contained the definitely Christian documents or New Testament, as well as the Jewish Scriptures to which

* A lay sermon preached in Christ's Hospital School Chapel, Horsham, July 1st, 1923.

Paul was referring, till finally they came to be regarded as *verbally inspired* and meaning therefore was obscured and misunderstood. Here are two striking instances of the way in which the obvious general meaning can be lost, and the very opposite blindly inculcated:

(1) The largest organized body of Christians, the Roman Catholic Church, has virtually deified the mother of our Lord: she is the 'Queen of Heaven,' and in popular devotion has almost taken the place of her Son. Yet every recorded reference of our Lord to His mother, except the words from the cross, in which He commends her to the care of His favourite disciple, contains a direct or implied rebuke to her or to others of the idea that the fact of her being His mother gave her a privileged position. 'Lady, what have I to do with thee?' 'Blessed is the womb that bare thee,' &c. 'Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God and do it.'

(2) You know the tremendous emphasis laid on Sabbath observance by the Scottish Presbyterian Church. In the seventeenth century it was a punishable offence to stroll through the fields on Sunday. Yet I think it is equally true that whenever our Lord refers to the Sabbath He does it by way of protest against the strict Sabbatarianism of the Jews of His day. 'The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath,' &c.; and it is clear from St. Mark's account that it was His persistence in healing on the Sabbath Day that first determined the authorities of the Jewish Church to treat the new teacher as a dangerous heretic instead of welcoming Him as an inspired prophet. It has been said with truth that if our Lord had lived in the Middle Ages, He could hardly have escaped being burnt at the stake as a heretic; and if He had been in Scotland in the days of the Solemn League and Covenant, He would infallibly have been taken up by the police for 'vageing on the Sabbath.'

But it was not only the attitude of organized Christianity towards questions of doctrine that was affected. Individual readers of the Bible were thrown into an unnatural attitude which deprived what they read of a great deal of its reality. Perhaps I can best explain what I mean by giving an experience of my own. I was very fond of the historical parts of the Old Testament as a boy, especially the stories in Joshua, Judges

and the wars of David, which seemed to me extraordinarily interesting. Yet I never thought of them as comparable with those in the early history of Greece and Rome: they were in the Bible, and therefore in a class by themselves. I remember asking the father of my school chum, who used to take us out on half holidays and had one of those bright minds that gave life and interest to everything he talked about, 'Were the Israelites really a warlike people?' 'Why, of course, you know they were,' was his reply. I am sure he thought I was shamming ignorance; but I was not, I asked the question in sober earnest. I knew the Israelites fought plenty of battles and often won against great odds, and if they had been Greeks or Romans, I should have recognized at once that they were good and courageous fighters. But then it was the Bible and not history: they were God's chosen people and not therefore to be judged by the same standard as ordinary men. They had an advantage which their enemies lacked. When they were loyal to Jehovah, He fought for them and the other side had no chance; when they fell away from Him, His support was withdrawn and they at once found their true level in defeat and servitude. In a way they were to me almost an unreal people. I was a boy of fair average intelligence, and I do not suppose I was very singular in this attitude. It was much the same as that of the translators of our Authorised Version. You remember the exploit of Jonathan and his armour-bearer in taking by direct assault in open day a hill-fort of the Philistines garrisoned by about twenty men. It was a desperate 'deed of derring-do,' just the kind of thing one would expect from a mediaeval champion. Indeed, of all the Old Testament heroes Jonathan comes nearest to the chivalric ideal, the knight without a thought of self, *sans peur and sans reproche*. Now the heading of the chapter, which as you know was written by the translators and is no part of the Hebrew text, runs thus, 'Jonathan miraculously smites the Philistines' garrison.' But if you read the story carefully, you will see that there was nothing miraculous about it at all. It was a miracle of daring, as we say, but nothing more. It was no more supernatural in character than the recorded achievements of many a Christian warrior who trusted in God, and in that trust won against apparently hopeless odds. A few

years ago a friend of mine, a great traveller, linguist, and missionary, told me he had been giving a lecture in the North of England on his experiences in Palestine, in which he discoursed a good deal about the upper waters of the Jordan. At the close a respectable artisan came up to the platform in response to an invitation to anyone who had questions to ask, and with a puzzled air accosted him thus : 'Now, do tell me, Sir! Is there really such a river as the Jordan?' The Great War has made Palestine a very real country to our working class, but a few years earlier I fancy this state of mind was not uncommon among them. The other parts of the Old Testament did not attract me much. Of the prophets, with the exception of the few great passages which are read out as lessons in the Church services, I naturally could make little or nothing, and had an uneasy feeling that this probably pointed to some depravity of heart on my part. I remember being greatly surprised and relieved at hearing my father, who was a first-rate Hebrew scholar, remark one day that some of the prophetic books were quite as hard as the worst choruses in Aeschylus. I had never thought of the subject in that way. It would have seemed to me almost an impiety to compare them with the work of a secular poet.

Now during the last fifty years a great movement has been going on in theology. Scholars have been studying the Bible and trying to understand it, in the same way and according to the same principles of interpretation as they would any other book. And the effect has been marvellous. The Old Testament has become a new book to us, far richer in reality and meaning than it ever was before. Jewish national heroes and saints have become living human figures, to be judged by the same standard as those of any other nation. The difficulties and perplexities caused by (i) statements inconsistent with modern scientific discovery, and (ii) inconsistencies in moral standard and contradictions in points of fact found in different parts, have disappeared. (i) Half the popular infidelity of the present day is due to the old view of the Bible as an inspired book, every word of which was equally true. The Hyde Park infidel orator generally starts from the Genesis story of Creation in six days, and his main thesis is the irreconcilability of the

Old Testament with modern science and especially with the doctrine of evolution. (ii) Again, the Old Testament is not a consistent whole, like the Koran, produced by one writer at one particular epoch. It is the continuous literature of a whole race spread over several centuries, and setting forth the gradual growth of institutions and thought in that race, just as Greek literature does for the history and the thought of the Greeks, and English literature for that of our own people, and it contains the work of many different authors and many different kinds of writing. Every extended national literature contains plenty of contradictions and inconsistencies on points of fact, and the Hebrew national literature is no exception. One of the most marked cases is the contrast between the history given in *Samuel* and *Kings*, and that given in *Chronicles*. You have only to read the reign of David and Solomon in each to find obviously conflicting accounts of the same incidents. As long as people thought the text of each had, so to speak, been dictated to the writer by the Holy Spirit, here was a difficulty that could not be got over, except by refusing to look at it. But the difficulty was even greater when it came to a difference in moral standard. It is impossible to read the books of the Old Testament with an open mind without seeing that the idea of right and wrong in the early historical books differs very considerably from what we find in the greatest of the prophets. Samuel orders Saul to attack without warning and put to the sword a whole tribe, men, women and children, because three centuries earlier their ancestors had attacked the Israelites on their way up from Egypt: and this is ascribed to a divine command. So the treacherous murder of Sisera by Jael is praised by the prophetess Deborah in the great song of triumph with which she celebrates the victory of Barak at the River Kishon: 'Blessed above women shall Jael be, the wife of Heber the Kenite': and it is easy to find other episodes equally shocking to us. But what we have to notice is that they depict a ruthless and savage cruelty, which would have shocked Isaiah to the soul, as proceeding from or at least approved by Jehovah. In short, the Old Testament is the record of the development of a particular race of remarkable individuality, and their growth in civilization and religious conceptions from the comparative

savagery of a wild desert tribe with a tribal God up to the centralized and civilized monarchy of the later kings under a God who was primarily the God of Israel but also the God of the whole earth. Jephthah, when he is negotiating with the Ammonites about the possession of territory, argues that Israel has a right to keep the land they had conquered from the Amorites because Jehovah, their God, had dispossessed the Ammonites, and then he goes on: 'Wilt thou not possess that which Chemosh thy god giveth thee to possess? So whomsoever Jehovah our God hath dispossessed from before us, them will we possess.' To Jephthah Jehovah was the God of Israel only; other tribes had other gods, not as good as Jehovah, but perhaps good enough for them. This is very different from Hezekiah's prayer after Sennacherib's insulting challenge to Jehovah: 'O Jehovah, the God of Israel, that sittest upon the cherubim, thou art the God, even thou alone of all the kingdoms of the earth; thou hast made heaven and earth . . . Hear the words of Sennacherib, wherewith he hath sent him to reproach the living God. Of a truth, Lord, the Kings of Assyria have laid waste the nations and their lands and have cast their gods into the fire, for they were no gods but the work of men's hands . . . Save thou us, I beseech thee, out of his hand, that all the kingdoms of the earth may know that thou art the Lord God, even thou only.' We have now got to *monotheism*. The Hebrew race grows like any other in institutions and in ideas, above all in religious ideas. But that only makes their history the more real, the more interesting, and the more convincing. Growth, development, in scientific phrase *evolution*, is the way in which God works in everything else; it is only reasonable to expect that he should work in the same way in the spiritual sphere.

But one naturally asks, if this be so, if the Hebrew history and literature is to be looked at and judged like that of any other nation, doesn't this destroy the value of the Old Testament for religion, doesn't it lose its special character? Far from it! It remains the record of the growth of the people to whom seems to have been entrusted in the education of the human race the development of the spiritual side of life, of the sense of man's relation to the Power that made and sustains the

universe. No man of open mind can, I think, read the Old Testament through without feeling that it stands alone among national literatures in this, that it views the course of history throughout from the standpoint of a strong and even passionate loyalty to God; that this loyalty was what kept their tribes together and ultimately welded them into a single nation, and that their idea of the nature of God steadily grew throughout their history, till it reached an ideal of righteousness and purity never conceived by any other people. We may put the contrast in this way. Greek history is essentially secular, Hebrew history essentially religious. The Gods appear in Greek history, but they come in almost as part of the national machinery, they exist for the nation. To the Old Testament writers, on the contrary, the nation exists for Jehovah. A special covenant or contract with Him made by their ancestor Abraham is the origin of their nationhood, and loyalty to Him the essential condition of its continuance. The development of thought in the Old Testament always starts from the spiritual side. The Old Testament is the one great national literature that consistently expresses this idea. In the divine guidance of human development, different nations seem to have been entrusted with different talents to be used for the common good of humanity. The Greeks were the great masters in the domain of pure intellect and to a less extent of art, the Romans in government and law, the Hebrews in religion and the things of the spirit. All our intellectual systems and methods derive ultimately from Greece (philosophy, mathematics, science); European law and the civic spirit and tradition that hold modern states together are in the main Roman; but the great world religions, Christianity and Islam, have their roots in Palestine. We feel in reading the Old Testament a deeper tone, an intenser moral purpose than in the classical writers. The difference is unmistakeable. Something of the same note may be heard in Aeschylus and Vergil, but only occasionally and never with equal insistence. It is the gift of the race. In other words, the right way to look upon the Bible, as was pointed out to me years ago by an eminent Christian scholar, is to 'regard it not as an inspired book, but as the literature of an inspired race.' And directly this is done, the difficulties created by the contradictions and

inconsistencies I have already mentioned disappear at once. For to say that a race or a man is inspired, is not to say they can make no mistakes. Inspiration is not infallibility: it does not supersede the natural powers, but quickens them and works through them. We feel it stronger in some writers than in others; we feel it varying in force from time to time in the same writer. The human element is always there, and where it is, there must remain the possibility of error.

Two great original literatures have moulded European thought and shaped European literature, the Hebrew and the Greek (I do not mention the Roman because, noble as it is, it is hardly original, but in the main a reflection of the Greek); and of these our own literature probably owes more to the loftiness and intensity of the Hebrew.

Where can we find prose narratives in any language to match a number of scenes in the historical books? *e.g.* (i) The revolt of Absalom (II *Samuel*); (ii) the Elijah chapters in Kings, particularly the great drama of the contest between Jehovah and Baal with the sacrifice on Mount Carmel; (iii) Ahab's expedition against Ramoth-Gilead, with the prophecy of Micaiah, the son of Imlah; or (iv) Jehu's conspiracy. In vivid portraiture, dramatic force, rush of movement and unity of effect they are unequalled. Pick out the most stirring narratives from Thucydides and Livy: they read almost tame in comparison.

Or take the poetry of the Book of Job, especially the great descriptions of nature uttered by the Voice from the Whirlwind:

THE WAR-HORSE.

'Hast thou given the horse strength?
Hast thou clothed his neck with thunder?
Hast thou made him to leap as a grasshopper?
The glory of his nostrils is terrible.
He paweth in the valley and rejoiceth in his strength,
He goeth on to meet the armed men.
He mocked at fear and is not affrighted,
Neither turneth he back from the sword.
The quiver rattleth against him, the flashing spear and the javelin.
He swalloweth the ground with fierceness and rage,
Neither believeth he that it is the voice of the trumpet.
He saith among the trumpets, Aha!
And he smelleth the battle afar off,
The thunder of the captains and the shouting.'

Or the great passage in the fourteenth chapter of *Isaiah*, where the King of Babylon, the great world-oppressor, is described as going down into the under-world, and all the dead rise up in their places to receive him with words of mockery (*N.B.*—Hell is Hades, not Gehenna!):

> 'How hath the oppressor ceased! the golden city ceased! The Lord hath broken the staff of the wicked, the sceptre of the rulers; that smote the peoples in wrath with a continual stroke, that ruled the nations in anger, with a persecution that none restrained. The whole earth is at rest and is quiet: they break forth into singing. Yea, the fir trees rejoice at thee, and the cedars of Lebanon, saying, Since thou art laid down, no feller is come up against us. Hell from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming: it stirreth up the dead for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth; it hath raised up from their thrones all the kings of the nations. All they shall answer and say unto thee, Art thou also become weak as we? art thou become like unto us? Thy pomp is brought down to hell, and the noise of thy viols: the worm is spread under thee, and worms cover thee. How art thou fallen from heaven, O day star, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst lay low the nations! And thou saidst in thy heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; and I will sit upon the mount of congregation, in the uttermost parts of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the Most High. Yet thou shalt be brought down to Hell, to the uttermost parts of the pit. They that see thee shall narrowly look upon thee, they shall consider thee, saying, Is this the man that made the earth to tremble, that did shake kingdoms; that made the world as a wilderness, and overthrew the cities thereof; that let not loose his prisoners to their home? All the kings of the nations, all of them, sleep in glory, every one in his own house. But thou art cast forth away from thy sepulchre like an abominable branch, clothed with the slain, that are thrust through with the sword, that go down to the stones of the pit; as a carcase trodden under foot.'

These are only translations; yet how little of the great poetry of the world can be placed beside them! Perhaps some choruses of the Prometheus and parts of 'Paradise Lost' come nearest.

Again the Psalms stand absolutely by themselves. To this day they remain the highest and intensest devotional poetry the human race has produced. Nothing can better show the extraordinary spiritual genius of Israel than the fact that, though Christianity has raised the spiritual level and European literature has the advantage of centuries of Christianity behind it, nothing has since been created that can compare with them. Most of our hymns sound weak and colourless in comparison.

Our greatest hymn, the one we use on all occasions when the heart of the community is deeply moved, 'O God, our help in ages past!' is simply a metrical version of the ninetieth psalm, which bears the heading, 'A Prayer of Moses, the man of God.'

Some years ago a distinguished writer, who afterwards did good service during the war as Minister of Agriculture, R. E. Prothero, now Lord Ernle, published a fascinating little volume called *The Psalms in Human Life.* It is an historical sketch, describing the part the Psalms have played at various periods in the life of Christian Europe, and a remarkable record it is. For it shows that wherever and whenever any body of Christians have been fighting for their lives or enduring oppression, there the Psalms of David have been their handbook of song, cheering them on to the attack ('Let God arise and let His enemies be scattered,' &c.) and sustaining them in the darkest hours of defeat, when like David they were being hunted like the partridge on the mountains. Thus it forms quite a handy summary of the religious wars and persecutions of Europe. All used it alike—Hussites, Huguenots, Roman Catholics, Puritans, Scottish Covenanters, English Episcopalians.

There is much in the Psalms that is quite opposed to the spirit of Christianity. The poet frankly hates his enemies and calls on God to destroy them. 'The righteous will wash his footsteps in the blood of the ungodly.' 'Let them be blotted out of the book of the living and not be written with the righteous.' It is habit that makes people hear these and similar words almost every Sunday without wincing. One of the changes that will almost certainly be made in any revision of the Prayer Book will be the substitution of selected Psalms in our services so as to avoid these passionate calls for vengeance and appeals to hatred. Yet though these breathe a spirit very far removed from that of the New Testament, there is nothing mean or petty about them; they are the utterances of men sorely tried, and unable to reconcile the hard facts of life and the prosperity of the wicked with the government of a righteous God. Even when packed with hate, they are still great poetry, and maintain their position as the supreme utterance of the human soul in its greatest exaltation and its deepest dejection. To most of you they will hardly appeal. They need

a wider experience of life. I remember more than fifty years ago reading in the school library a diary of an English civilian during the Indian Mutiny. He was one of an English non-combatant party, men and women, who found themselves cut off in a district beset by mutineers, and underwent weeks and weeks of nerve-racking agony, never knowing what a day would bring forth or when death or far worse than death might not leap upon them. Each day he noted some passage from the Psalms which had kept him and his companions from giving up in despair. At the time I thought it all rather strange, With weekly repetition in church, the words had become trite and almost commonplace to me; the Prayer Book version, too, though always rhythmical, often makes poor sense, and to a boy's mind may sometimes even take on something of a ludicrous flavour.

The New Testament is the work of the same race. St. Paul, the greatest missionary in all history, the man who made Christianity a world religion instead of a Jewish sect, was, as he says himself, a Hebrew of the Hebrews. It is a continuation of the Old Testament, and hardly intelligible apart from it.

The New Testament also contains great literature, though this is apt to be obscured by the fact that the original is written not in the classical language in which the great Attic masterpieces are enshrined, but in the colloquial Greek, which formed a kind of *lingua franca* for the Levant at the beginning of our era, a fact which has created some prejudice in certain scholarly circles; a well-known and distinguished man of this school once declared that he never read the Greek Testament for fear it should spoil his Greek prose style. A truer estimate was that which appeared from the pen of a less pedantic writer not very long ago, that for human culture the four Gospels were perhaps the most important documents in existence. The Book of Acts, too, as mere historical writing is quite in the first rank, and in letter-writing the Epistles of St. Paul stand in a class by themselves. But it is rather as a record of the completion of that course of the development of religion which we see going on in the Old Testament that the New Testament engages our attention to-night. It is the record of the life and teaching of Him who was not only the last of the great pro-

phets of the Hebrew race, Who taught the chosen people with ever-increasing clearness and insight the true nature of God and His relation to the human soul, but was also in His own Person the final revelation to man of that nature and that relation. This revelation took place no doubt at one particular point in history, but that does not bring the process of development to a close. If our Lord embodies in Himself, as we believe, the fullness of the Divine Nature, then no one nation and no one generation can fully exhaust the knowledge of Him; and if His living presence is with His followers according to His promise, 'Lo, I am with you, even to the end of the world,' as we also believe, then the knowledge of His nature and all that it means to us must go on growing, through the ages. It has often been noticed that our Lord's character transcends the limits of sex and nationality. It is capable of satisfying the highest needs of the woman as well as of the man, of the Gentile as well as of the Jew, of the Asiatic as well as of the European, of the negro as well as of the Asiatic. Each race has some special need of its own, of which it will find the full satisfaction in Him. Each, therefore, as it embraces Christianity, will bring out some new feature in His character which had previously been hardly realized: thus the spread of Christianity will be a progressive discovery of the fullness of Christ. And the growth of human knowledge and human activities, which is constantly creating new needs and raising new problems, will act in the same way. Constant growth and the change involved in growth therefore lies before us, but life means growth and change, and Christianity is the religion of life. In our Lord's own words: 'I came that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.'

LYRA APOSTOLICA

(1836 A.D. and 1923 A.D.)

By the Rev. ALFRED FAWKES, M.A., Vicar of Ashby St. Ledgers, author of *Studies in Modernism.*

NOT long ago I picked up on a bookstall a little duodecimo volume of verse bound in old-fashioned calf gilt, with marbled leaves. It was an early edition of the *Lyra Apostolica*. This offspring of the Tractarian muse was published in 1836; and, at the time, its popularity was scarcely less than that of *The Christian Year*. Now, though it deserves a better fate, it has been forgotten; and its interest is that of a survival of a time further removed from ours by temper than in years, a milestone marking the distance travelled between then and now. The verses appeared originally in the *British Magazine* between 1833 and 1836; Keble, Isaac Williams (author of *The Cathedral*), R. H. Froude, Robert Wilberforce and J. W. Bowden being contributors. Their contributions, however, were occasional: the book is practically Newman's, and was written during his Italian travels in the end of 1832 and the beginning of 1833. He was already up in arms against the political and religious tendencies which had found expression in the first Reform Bill; and was ill at ease in the Church of England, though he had then no thought of leaving it. But the growth of Liberalism 'fretted him inwardly,' and he was 'fierce' against its representatives. He speaks of the Revolution of 1830 as an 'Apostasy': passing through Paris, he refused to leave his hotel; and, when a French ship came into harbour at Algiers, he would not even look at the tricolour. He thinks of France as she was in the eighth century:

> 'When Poictiers showed her zeal for the true creed.'

As she is—not a word:

> By silence I will now proclaim
> Hate of thy present self, and scarce will sound thy name.'

Hatred, it must be confessed, bulks large in his Gospel; his exhortation to the weak-kneed Christian in love with love is:

> 'Awake! thy easy dreams resign;
> First learn thee how to hate.'

It is, alas, a lesson too easily learned and too hardly forgotten. The corollaries to which it led him are singular. The murderous Jehu is taken to task, not for his deeds of blood, but for his moral unworthiness to perform them:

'Anger and Zeal,
And the Joy of the Brave'—

as exhibited in the massacre of the sons of Ahab and the Baal-worshippers—are virtues too high for sinners. On the other hand, in the crimes of David—

'O Heart of fire! misjudged by wilful man'—

he sees

'The portent of a blood-stained holiness.'

It was a later Newman who wrote that 'not all the actions of the saints are saintly'; he had 'reached a purer air.'

The generous ardours of such men as Arnold and Whately were anathema to him:

'O new-ventured art
Of the ancient Foe!—but what, if it extends
O'er our own camp, and rules amid our friends?'

His invective against them is:

'Ye cannot halve the Gospel of God's grace,
Men of presumptuous heart!'

In the Royal Supremacy, that historical safeguard of our religious liberties, he sees only a galling bondage:

'How long, O Lord, how long
Shall Cæsar do us wrong?'

nor is the policy of the Church one of non-resistance:

'Christ bade His followers take the sword.'

In later days Bishop Patterson, like himself a convert to Rome, described him as 'a lamb by Grace, but a tiger by Nature.' He was, in fact, a born fighter—no one who was not could have written the *Apologia*: the motto prefixed to these verses, published 'in the humble hope that they may be instrumental in recalling or recommending to the reader important Christian truths which are at this day in a way to be forgotten,' is the famous line of the Iliad, in which Achilles announces his return to the battle:

Γνοῖεν δ' ὡς δὴ δῆρον ἐγὼ πολέμοιο πέπαυμαι—
'They shall know the difference now that I am back.'

They did. He 'smote his enemies in the hinder parts': he had an extraordinary power of making people look ridiculous when

they were merely reasonable, and wrong when they were in the right.

The element of fear was prominent in his presentation of religion: the truths which he accentuated, if truths they were, were the hard truths. In one of his first sermons, he had said:

> 'I do not shrink from uttering my firm conviction that it would be a gain to the country were it vastly more superstitious, more bigoted, more gloomy, more fierce in its religion than it is.'

The movement of which he was the leader did its best to make it so. But the bow, bent too tightly, breaks: its violence defeated itself, leaving us as we are—perhaps overmuch 'at ease in Zion.' His followers, however, had the courage of their opinions. With Tertullian they looked forward to 'the red dooming hour,' and exulted in the thought of

> 'Those stern judgment-fires, which shall complete
> Earth's strife with Heaven, and ope the endless woe.'

While—strange paradox—they found this appalling picture in the personal teaching of the Saviour:

> 'Christ on Himself, considerate Master, took
> The utterance of that doctrine's fearful sound.
> The Fount of Love His servants sends to tell
> Love's deeds; Himself proclaims the sinner's hell.'

It is pleasant to turn from this core of darkness, not yet perhaps entirely overcome in popular theology, to those happy fruits of the Gospel which accompany its preaching even in its least worthy forms. We know, indeed, that 'to ourselves individually, and still more to the world at large, goodness is a very dear bargain when purchased at the expense of truth.' Yet there is something in the lives of these men and women which we would gladly find in our own, and for which we seem to look in vain in the world as we know it.

Sublatam ex oculis quærimus invidi: we miss their seriousness, their austerity, their delicate touch, their sense of the Presence of God. Here the *Lyra* has a scent of fragrant, if somewhat faded, *pot-pourri*. And the roses were real roses: overlaid as it was by foreign elements, the Christian thing itself was there. 'Lead, kindly Light,' which has found its way into the hymnals of all the Churches, is the best-known example of this; but there are others as perfect, though less familiar.

> 'A pilgrim pale, with Paul's sad girdle bound,'

the singer is human. He returns thanks for

'Blessings of friends, which to my door
Unasked, unhoped, have come';

yet he is as one apart—

'Thrice blest are they who feel their loneliness';

be it as it may with others, he

'Must but hear the sound
Of the still voice divine.'

He dwells much in the past, and with its great figures—with Basil, and the Cappadocians, with Chrysostom, with Theodoret, with Origen—he 'will not believe that so great a soul can be lost.' His picture of the scholar-saint, Gregory Nazianzen—'Bright Angel of the East!' yet out of place as a bishop; 'Thou couldst a people raise, but couldst not rule'—how true to life it is! Neither he nor Gregory had the heavy touch of the official. Both were more like good men than bishops: had it rained mitres, none would have fitted either head.

The stanzas on the Cross are as exquisite in form as they are devout in temper.

'Whene'er across this sinful flesh of mine
I draw the Holy Sign,
All good thoughts stir within me, and collect
Their slumbering strength divine;
Till there springs up that hope of God's elect
My faith shall ne'er be wrecked.
And who shall say, but hateful spirits round,
For their brief hour unbound,
Shudder to see, and wail their overthrow?
While on far heathen ground
Some lonely Saint hails the fresh odour, though
Its source he cannot know.'

The same may be said of those on Death, beginning:

'Whene'er goes forth Thy dread command
And my last hour is nigh';

and of the commemoration of those departed this life:

'Who in the mountain-grots of Eden lie,
And hear the fourfold river as it murmurs by.

They hear it sweep
In distance down the dark and savage vale;
But they at rocky bed, or current deep,
Shall never more grow pale:
They hear, and meekly muse, as fain to know
How long untired, unspent, that giant stream shall flow.'

While those on the Eucharist, ending:

> 'Hence, disputants! The din which ye admire
> Keeps but ill measure with the Church's choir,'

are in the very spirit of Hooker.

> 'What these elements are in themselves it skilleth not; it is enough that, to me who take them, they are the body and blood of Christ. Why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant but this: O my God, Thou art true; O my soul, thou art happy!'

A generation later, in 1863, a great Oxford teacher, perhaps the finest type of the pure scholar that the University ever produced, contrasted the Epigoni of the Tractarians with the party which in his youth had 'sat at the feet of Dr. Newman.' They had, he tells us, outgrown their learning; their literature had grown feebler at each increase of their strength. They had lost the best traditions of Anglicanism—its moderation, its dignity, its repose—and acquired in their place the worst features of religious faction; they had become more vulgar, more violent, more bitterly partisan. Their victories, considerable as they had been, had been neither religious nor intellectual; they had increased in number, they had enlarged their area, they had appealed only too successfully to the uneducated—but there was a fatal weakness within. They had a set of borrowed *dogmata*, but no theology; they felt that intelligence was against them; and—*odisse quem læseris*—having renounced the use of reason, they were compelled to go on to revile it, and to declare war upon ideas. The whole essay—on *Learning in the Church of England*—is as much, or more, to the point now as it was when it was written. For Literature revenges herself on those who slight her; divorce religion from learning, and religion dies.[1]

What Pattison says is perfectly true. But I am not sure that the deterioration which he describes is due to any double dose of original sin in the section of the Church of which he is speaking. It seems, at least in great part, to be the result of the inevitable degradation of the idea when it appears in a material setting; to the contradiction between what an old philosophy spoke of as Matter and Form. The history of religion leads us to think this. In the fourth century, in the matter

[1] Mark Pattison. *Essays*, vol. ii, p. 263.

of intolerance—a test question for Churches—there was little to choose between Athanasian and Arian; in the fifth between Monophysite and Nestorian; in the seventeenth Selden, who was no friend to bishops, found the Westminster Divines even more intolerable; in its time the tyranny of the *Record* was as heavy-handed and as illiterate as is that of the *Church Times*. It is in the nature of things that this should be so. For, as soon as you have said the word Church, you have brought in an element alien, and even hostile, to the Gospel. I do not mean that we can do without the Church. Religion must be given through something; and a Church is a necessary evil, stress being laid on both words. 'It was the special privilege of the primitive Church,' says Newman, with one of those flashes of insight which, even in his worst moments, break in upon us, and show his real greatness, 'to be without creeds and confessions of faith.' Certainly the greatest change which ever passed over Christianity was when the little flock of believers became a World Church, an international society with an exterior polity, an official clergy, a fixed dogma and ritual, a defined creed. It was as if you had tried to arrest a volatile essence. In vain: it has escaped you. You think that you have caught it: no; what you have caught is something entirely different. The real thing has been lost in the process, and has disappeared.

What attracts us—and there is much that attracts us—in the *Lyra* is not its dark and cruel ecclesiasticism, its damnatory clauses, its savage anticipation of vengeance on 'high-voiced Korahs' swallowed by the pit—

> 'Earth heard and sank, and they were gone,
> Only their dismal parting groan
> The shuddering car long time will haunt.
> Thus rebels fare'—

these horrors repel: but lying alongside of them, unreconciled and irreconcilable, we have a grace, a spiritual fragrance, a ready sympathy with and insight into human nature; a quick instinct for the divine. Have *e.g.* the two sides of the Communion of Saints ever been more happily expressed than in the lines entitled 'Separation'?

> 'Do not their souls, who 'neath the Altar wait
> Until their second birth,
> The gift of Patience need, as separate
> From their first friends on earth?

Ah! dearest, with a word he could dispel
All questioning, and raise
Our hearts to rapture, whispering all was well,
And turning prayer to praise.

And other secrets, too, he could declare;
By patterns all divine
His earthly creed re-touching here and there,
And deepening every line.

Dearest! he longs to speak, as I to know;
And yet we both refrain:
It were not good; a little doubt below,
And all will soon be plain.'

Who that have lost those whom they love, and must love for ever, can read these lines unmoved?

Considering its source, the suggestion contained in them is unexpected: may we, can we, 'retouch our earthly creeds'? Surely in all the Churches, and in the darkest periods, men of the wiser sort have distinguished the permanent from the passing in religion: selecting, like good money-changers, what served their purpose; and, since truth stands in relation, letting the rest go by. In this sense we are better than our creeds—'I am wiser than my teachers,' says the Psalmist—because in spiritual things 'there is neither speech nor language'; they are discerned spiritually—God manifests Himself not to sight and hearing, but inwardly, to the conscience and the heart. This is why attacks on and apologies for religion, as a rule, miss the mark: it is neither injured by the one, nor protected by the other. Produce them as you will, they do not come into contact with it; it is on another plane than theirs.

Lastly, if we expect to find the questions of our own time answered either in Scripture, or in the standards of the Church, or by the great theologians of the past, directly—*i.e.* in the language, or on the lines of the thought of to-day—we shall be disappointed. Such an expectation is unreasonable; and we have simply to get out of the way of entertaining it. To do so is to look for an anachronism; and anachronisms do not occur. There is an order in the mental and moral as well as in the physical world. What were our understandings given us for but to discern it? Art thou a teacher in Israel, we may ask those who overlook or ignore this, and knowest not these things? 'First the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear.'

THE NEED FOR RESTATEMENT

By Canon DURELL, B.D., C.B.E., Rector of Clapham.

MANY of us have been greatly concerned in recent years to note the increasing falling away of so large a proportion of the population from all forms of organized religion. In searching for the reason for this, we are driven to the conclusion that it is largely due to a sense of unreality in the teaching of the Churches. Christian doctrine, as commonly presented, seems to have little or no relation to the facts of life. There is urgent need for such a restatement as will bring our teaching into vital relationship with the needs and categories of thought of the present day.

Take, for instance, the current presentation of the doctrine of the Atonement, with its traditional phrases such as 'the Blood of Christ,' its theory of an infinite debt and a substitutionary payment made to God, or to abstract justice or even to the devil. To the modern lay mind it seems neither rational nor moral. The question, 'Padre, how *does* Christ save us?' is said to have been asked during the war. And the conventionally trained padre could give no convincing answer. The doctrine is conveyed in metaphors, which have long since become petrified and have lost their power to illustrate the truth. So the teaching of the Church seems to be jargon: it needs re-statement.

We should not be surprised at this necessity. For theology cannot be the only science to stand still. There have been rapid changes in philosophical thought, in natural science, in historical criticism. And since all truth is ultimately one, the extension of the frontier in these branches of knowledge must necessarily have a bearing upon our knowledge of God and His ways. They must influence our mode of presentation of religious truth. We cannot think of God and Christ as men did when they fashioned the Creeds or even as did our fathers. There is therefore nothing singular in the summons to readjust our ideas at the present time. The same call has been heard in every age when the Church has been alive.

Those, who refuse to re-consider their formulae, should remember that the process is at work in the New Testament itself. A conspicuous example of re-interpretation and re-statement is found in the Fourth Gospel. Christianity, starting from its Jewish cradle, had come into contact with Hellenism. Men, whose minds were steeped in the Hellenic philosophy of the time, had embraced Christianity. Their thoughts were moulded by Hellenism: their categories were Hellenic. Their living faith in Christ required to be wedded to their Hellenic cast of thought.

The Fourth Gospel, with its inspired presentation of the teaching of Christ, is the offspring of this need. It is not a new Gospel: its form indeed is new, but it is a true spiritual interpretation of the one Gospel of Christ. Indeed, so loyal is it to its origin that an Aramaic atmosphere is present throughout, so much so as to suggest an Aramaic original. But its framework of thought is Greek. It presents the original Gospel, seen through the mental outlook of a Hebrew mind steeped in Hellenic thought. It is an example of inspired insight, producing a definite development and re-statement of the faith.

Thus the Johannine writings are an illustration of the dynamic aspect of the Christian faith. For the faith is not static as the phrase, 'Once for all delivered to the saints,' seems to suggest. The living Spirit is a dynamic power leading the Church ever on towards a fallen apprehension of the truth.

Take, for instance, the doctrine of God. Now our conception of God is far from being of mere theoretical importance; it determines our whole view of life. But it is no longer possible for us to believe many things about God, which were believed by the Jews and embodied in the Old Testament. In the minds of many people, Christianity is discredited, because they suppose it to be bound up with beliefs about God which they find in the Hebrew Scriptures, and which their moral sense makes them disclaim. They are probably oblivious of the fact that this moral sense of theirs is a product of Christianity, and of nothing else whatever. If they remembered this, it would make them pause and look for a fallacy in their premisses before reaching their conclusion condemnatory of the Christian faith.

Still, we must not give them ground for their accusation. And it must be admitted that much current teaching has given an excuse for supposing that the Church adopts a quite untenable position in regard to Old Testament inspiration: 'this Blessed Book infallible from cover to cover,' as the writer has heard it described. It was a strange view of inspiration which led a high dignitary of the Church in the recent debates of the National Assembly to propound the dilemma that a psalm is either inspired or uninspired: if uninspired, it should not be used in public worship: if inspired, it is impious to excise verses which offend the Christian conscience. A far more fruitful conception of inspiration is necessary if the Church is to show the world of the present day how to use the Bible for the training of its spiritual life.

In the same spirit also we are bound to examine the forms in which Christian doctrine has been embodied. The dead hand of tradition must not be allowed to confine our outlook. We must be ready always to accept new light, through whatever media it comes to us from the one source, which is the Holy Spirit.

New Christian formularies were for the most part crystallized in the first six centuries. They embody philosophical terms, which belong to a philosophy that is obsolete. There are probably few instructed people at the present time who do not admit that at least some degree of interpretation is necessary in the Creeds. And the interpretation that we are bound to give will not always harmonize with the thoughts in the minds of those who framed the Creeds.

Can we then satisfy our intellectual and spiritual needs by giving to our existing formularies an interpretation consonant with our modern outlook? Or shall we find it necessary, to some extent at least, to re-write the Creeds? It becomes a grave question whether some of the technical terms used must not now be discarded. Take, for example, the word 'Person' as applied to the distinctions in the Godhead. This term is, almost inevitably, the cause of very serious misunderstanding in the popular mind. With us the word 'Person' means an individual being, a separate centre of consciousness. But the Greek original meant nothing of the kind. The Greek ὑπόστασις

was most unfortunately translated by Tertullian into the Latin *Persona*, a word which has been responsible for confused and mischievous thought ever since his day. It is the use of this word 'Person,' which lays the Athanasian Creed open to the charge of being a meaningless paradox. It renders a great deal of current teaching in the Church indistinguishable virtually from Tritheism, and in the mind of the ordinary layman it discredits the glorious doctrine of the ever Blessed Trinity.

All this emphasizes the urgent need for prayer and study. Our religion must not be allowed to become the victim either of the antiquarian or the crank. The presentation of the faith must be as much abreast of the times as medical or mechanical science. A priest who said recently, 'We Anglo-Catholics do not want Modernism in any shape or form,' was, if his standpoint is representative, sounding the death-knell of his school. Our aim must be to make our religion vital and real, to give to the people such an adequate knowledge of what the Christian faith really is as will commend it alike to the reason and the heart.

IN THE IMAGE OF GOD

THE fact that the Christian Church fails to put into practice what it professes to believe in theory is a source of moral weakness both to itself and to the communities it strives to serve.

The idea that a woman may not minister in the sanctuary is not only something which is contrary to Christian principles, but is a survival of the pagan conception of the ceremonial uncleanness of women mingled with a superstitious belief in religious 'taboos.'[1] Why potential motherhood should be considered less holy than fatherhood in a modern community we do not understand. On July 6, 1921, when Convocation met, the Bishop of London found it necessary to draw the attention of the House of Bishops to the statement made at a public meeting in the Church House, during his absence from the diocese, when the words 'revolting and repulsive' were used concerning women ministering in the Church. He con

[1] Vide *Women in the Lay Ministries*, by Letitia D. Fairfield, C.B.E. M.D.

sidered such words were most wrongly used, and he wished to dissociate himself entirely from them.[2]

In some churches even the young women who sing in the choirs are not allowed to take their places by the side of the boys, but are relegated to back seats or to seats in another part of the church, away from the men and boys.

This ecclesiastical injustice reaches its height in the statement that women, by reason of their sex, are 'incapable of receiving the grace of Holy Order.'[3] We can understand that those who are opposed to granting the priesthood to women should do so on the grounds of expediency or lack of traditional custom, but that they should attempt to do so on principle is surely running contrary to the truth of God.

It is well, perhaps, to examine briefly the reasons given by those who are opposed to granting women fuller opportunities in the ministry of the Churches. The three principal reasons that merit attention are: (1) The teaching of St. Paul; (2) Catholic custom; (3) Tradition.

The teaching of St. Paul in regard to women has become quite an obsession in the minds of many people, so that his authority would seem almost to overshadow that of his Divine Master. With them the 'letter' of St. Paul's teaching looms so largely in the foreground as to darken the 'spirit' of understanding—surely the last result the apostle himself would have desired.

Much injustice has been done to St. Paul by those who constantly quote only a part of what he said on this particular subject, without taking into consideration the whole of the context, and also the general principle for which he was known to stand.

[2] *Chronicle of Convocation,* July, 1921. No. 3.

[3] The wording of the protest presented by the E.C.U. to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, on January 30th, 1922, in order that the information might be communicated to the Houses of Convocation, was in the following terms:—

> 'We, the undersigned, Women Communicants of the Church of England, in accord with the fact that the Catholic Church does not recognise women as being capable of receiving the grace of Holy Order, desire to protest against the suggestion that they are capable of receiving that grace, and deprecate the endeavour that is being made to ignore this fact, and to allow women to preach publicly or minister in Churches.'

The two thoughts that St. Paul seems to have in his mind in I Cor. xiv are (1) the keeping of order in the early Christian Church, (2) the freedom of the individual Christian in the new religion.

In order to maintain the former he is inclined to hark back to the law. On the other hand, remembering the glorious liberty that is in Christ Jesus, he is anxious that his converts shall be free from the bondage of the law. This necessarily causes some conflict of thought, even in St. Paul's mind. It is difficult to reconcile the uncompromising severity of the 'letter' of the law to the 'spirit' of the freedom of Christianity. The early Christians were naturally surrounded by the customs and conventions of their times. We can imagine how exceedingly difficult it would be to set themselves free from the observances of the law, as well as to step beyond the social customs of the times. For the well-being of the young Church it was not altogether wise that conventional customs should be ignored. For the reputation and future development of the Christian Church it was necessary that it should, to a certain extent, conform to the conventions of Greek and Roman society. The whole of the new religion as taught by our Lord was quite sufficiently revolutionary from the old Judaism (or in any case from the popular interpretation of it) to create serious opposition.

If we read the whole of I Cor. xiv, I think we must inevitably gather that what St. Paul is aiming at is order in the Churches. A very important point to remember is that when St. Paul speaks of the 'Churches' he is not referring to consecrated buildings, for there were none in the early days of Christianity. What he is referring to is the assembly of the faithful who met together in any suitable place, and frequently in the houses of the chief women of the community. So that what he said did not refer to 'churches' as we know them.

Another point to consider is what kind of 'speaking' in the assembly of Christians did St. Paul mean? All through the chapter he is talking about 'speaking.' He talks of 'speaking with tongues,' 'prophesying' and 'teaching,' and his conclusion about them is that those who 'speak' are not to speak all at

once. 'for God is not a God of confusion,' and 'all things are to be done unto edifying.'

It would appear from verse 35 that the kind of 'speaking' which he would not permit to women was certainly not prophesying or teaching, for he says, 'if they would ask anything, let them ask their own husbands at home.' This, surely, implies that the women had been asking questions unsuitable to the occasion—some of them, perhaps, in a contentious, clamorous, fashion. This is borne out by his last sentence, 'Let all things be done decently and in order.' In *I Tim.* ii, 11, 12, we have 'Let a woman learn in quietness with all subjection. But I permit not a woman to teach, nor to have dominion over a man, but to be in quietness.' This goes beyond anything in *Corinthians*, and it ought to be remembered that many New Testament students doubt whether they are St. Paul's words.

Another probable reason why St. Paul did not positively forbid prophecy or teaching by women is that women undoubtedly *did* prophesy and teach in St. Paul's day. We find that he gives directions as to their having their heads veiled when they prophesied or prayed; this again in deference to prevailing custom, for it was only the courtesan of the time who went unveiled in Corinth or Athens, and St. Paul did not wish his converts to give any occasion for scandal in the Church. They were, he says, 'to give no occasion of stumbling either to Jews or to Greeks or to the Church' (*I Cor.* x, 32). That women taught individual members of the faithful assembly we know from the fact that Priscilla (with her husband Aquila) expounded to the Jew Appollos 'the way of the Lord more accurately,' although Appollos was already 'mighty in the Scriptures.'

St. Paul did undoubtedly acquiesce to a certain extent in the prevailing practice of the subjection of women in social matters, just as he admitted slavery for the time being. But that he believed in the spiritual subjection or inequality of women we cannot think, if we take into consideration the whole of his writings and the principles for which he stood. It was undoubtedly very difficult for St. Paul to shake himself free from conventional custom, and perhaps even more difficult for him to shake others free.

There are two points we ought to notice about St. Paul's attitude to the subjection of women. The first is the reason he gives for this subjection, *viz.* the good effect to be produced upon their unbelieving husbands that they 'may be gained by the behaviour of their wives,'—'beholding your chaste behaviour coupled with fear,' as St. Paul puts it. Secondly, in support of this subjection St. Paul quotes the law. Now although he quotes the law in support of the subjection of women, 'Let them be subject as also, saith the law' (I *Cor.* xiv, 34), yet upon other occasions he is most emphatic in his desire that Christians should shake themselves free from the bondage of the law. He says that the law 'worketh wrath,' and that 'the law is death but Christ is life.' Particularly in the matter of circumcision is he anxious that Christians shall be free from the law, and he even 'resisted' St. Peter because of his 'fearing them that were of the circumcision and dissembling before them' (*Gal.* ii, 11-14). To the Galatians he says, 'I, Paul, say unto you, that if ye receive circumcision Christ will profit you nothing: ye are severed from Christ ye who would be justified by the law, ye are fallen away from grace' (*Gal.* v, 2, 4).

And again, 'But not even Titus, who was with me, being a Jew, was compelled to be circumcised. And that because of the false brethren privily brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage; to whom we gave place in the way of subjection, no, not for an hour: that the truth of the Gospel might continue with you' (*Gal.* ii, 3-5). St. Paul evidently had no intention of surrendering his own Christian liberty. It is, apparently, only in regard to women that the law of subjection is to hold good. This one-sided treatment suggests the question of a modern writer, 'Why was the law reputable only when it oppressed woman, and redemption only powerless when it might redeem her?'[4]

If St. Paul could advocate the setting aside of the law upon such an important religious custom as circumcision, it is inconsistent to suppose that with the change of social custom and conditions, women could not be freed from the constraint of the law, and allowed to exercise their spiritual gifts.

[4] *Ecce Mater*, by M. A. R. Tuker.

Another reason urged by St. Paul in support of the subjection of women is the account of the Creation in *Genesis*. God created man in His own image'—'man' being the word which denotes 'mankind'—'male and female created He them.' The Hebrew word to denote 'mankind' was 'Adam,' the original human being. Its meaning was restricted later to denote the male only. St. Paul infers that the male only was made in God's image, and the female in the image of the male, which is unsound exegesis, but undoubtedly reflects the common Jewish view of the inferiority of women.

Yet St. Paul realizes that this customary inferiority of the woman is inconsistent with his theoretical belief in the spiritual equality of the sexes. He points out that 'in the Lord' there is a qualification of this custom. 'Howbeit neither is the woman without the man nor the man without the woman in the Lord. For as the woman is of the man, so is the man also of the woman; but all things are of God' (I *Cor.* xi, 11). And 'There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female: for ye are all one man) in Christ Jesus' (*Gal.* iii, 28). 'Ye are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus' (*Gal.* iii, 26).

So that to get at the real mind of St. Paul, if we want to quote in support of the subjection of women, we must consider the whole context of his writings, the customs and limitations of the times he lived in, and above all, to judge him fairly, we must look for what were his dominating principles—and these certainly were the liberty of the individual Christian, and his or her right to make full use of spiritual gifts to the edifying of the Church and the glory of God.

St. Paul told the early Christians that they were to 'desire earnestly to prophesy' and to 'forbid not to speak with tongues' (I *Cor.* xiv, 39). And knowing the greatness of St. Paul's character, must we not believe that if he lived to-day he would not allow either himself or his fellow-Christians to be hindered in exercising any Christian gift or grace by the restrictions of past ages which no longer apply to the particular period in which we are living?

Following close upon the steps of St. Paul comes the second reason urged by the objectors to the ministry of women, that

of Catholic custom. Here also we must beware of the paralysing influence of a blind adherence to 'the letter,' to the exclusion of the spirit of progress. To say that because a certain thing has not, hitherto, been the custom, therefore it shall never be, is to take the life out of any institution. If this principle had been adhered to in other departments of life no progress of any kind would have been possible, and man would have remained in his primitive state. Can we believe that such stagnation would have been according to the Mind of God?

Where the authority claimed for Catholic custom is not Scriptural: it is based mainly upon the Councils of the Church. But history has proved that these Councils have not always been immutable or infallible. The earliest Synods were convened to secure uniformity of doctrine and practice in the Churches. They were, at first, provincial meetings of bishops, and their decisions, though communicated to other Churches, were not binding on these. The first Oecumenical or General Council—that of Nicea—was convoked by Constantine in 325, and he declared that its decisions were inerrable. During the fourth century, the belief in the infallibility of this great Council increased, and was extended to future General Councils. But a point particularly to be noted is that this infallibility was attached to decisions *in rebus fidei et morum*, in matters of faith and morals, and *not* to those regarding discipline and practice. Each branch of the Catholic Church has considered itself to be more or less free in regard to the latter. Even the canons of the General Councils have in certain cases become obsolete, and those of the lesser Councils have only had local authority. In looking back upon history the wisdom of these Councils, still more their infallibility, is not unquestionable.

The Fathers are frequently quoted as indicative of the mind of the Church in opposing the ministry of women. St. Thomas Aquinas is put forward as the arch-opposer, but his reasoning on this subject in the *Summa Theologica* will not appear conclusive to the mind of the present day.

But not all the Fathers were opposed to the ministry of women. St. Chrysostom regretted the separation of the sexes in the Church of his day, and said the early Church assembly without sex distinction was 'worthy of heaven.' Referring to

Phoebe and Prisca he says, 'You see these were noble women hindered in no way by their sex in the course of virtue, and this is as might be expected, for in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female.' He did not think it impossible that Junia should be 'of note among the apostles.' He says, 'Oh, how great was the devotion of this woman that she should be counted worthy of the appellation of apostle.'

Can it be claimed that we have a truly Catholic ministry if women are excluded from it? In the words of Bishop Brent:

> 'Catholicity has nothing to recommend it unless it is the condition in which everything is measured and considered in terms of the whole.'

God has obviously bestowed prophetic and priestly gifts upon women, and the Church must be the poorer for its lack of their use.

It is a poor mind that has no reverence for the past and the lessons it can teach us. In so far as Tradition enshrines the truth it is valuable, but if it be permitted to hinder the progress of truth, then it becomes a source of danger to the spiritual life of the Church. We have the solemn words of warning spoken by our Lord, lest by a blind and too rigid adherence to Tradition we make the word of God of none effect. The work of the Holy Spirit must not be hindered. The glory of the Church is the indwelling of His presence, and He has promised to lead us into all truth.

But have we not somewhat fallen away from the true spirit of Christian Tradition? If we go far enough back and ask what was our Lord's attitude towards the ministry of women, shall we not find that He never denied them any opportunity to minister to Him? Women not only received the first vision of the Resurrection, but were commissioned by our Lord Himself to be the first messengers of the risen Christ. Yet it is only right to add that our Lord did not choose a woman to be one of the twelve apostles, nor to be one of the seventy disciples, nor did He give a formal commission to any woman to preach the Gospel. This was not regarded by the early Church as prohibiting women with special spiritual gifts, like the daughters of Philip, from exercising them in the Christian assembly, but no doubt it did tend to prevent ordinary women,

especially married women with household duties, from bein normally admitted to the Christian ministry.

It is often urged that the admission of women to the priest hood and episcopate in the English Church would prove hindrance to re-union. We are told that if this were practised the Churches of Rome and the East would no longer conside the possibility of re-union. But granted the principle to b right, are we to preclude these Churches from a possible guid ance of the Holy Spirit in the matter?

Some little while ago, at a public meeting, a prominen priest of the Roman Communion expressed his belief that th subject of the ministry of women, so far as his own Churc was concerned, was an open question: and that because it ha not been permitted in the past, was no reason why it should no be permitted in the future.

Shortly after the war, at a service held in the Eastern Or thodox Church at Jerusalem, nuns were permitted to take prominent part in the offices preparatory to the Liturgy; an before the unhappy conditions now prevailing in the Churc in Russia, the Holy Synod appointed a Committee to enquir into the work and status of the diaconate for women.

But be this as it may with regard to these Churches, hav we not also to consider the desirability of re-union with th Free Churches? In this connection we must take into con sideration the fact that some of these Churches have alread admitted women to their ministries.

Prejudice and convention die hard even in the moder mind, but the entry of women in the past few years into s many of the professions looked upon as a male monopoly is proof that these barriers are not impregnable.

In this matter of the spiritual and moral equality of th sexes, the Church should lead rather than wait to be led. It above all for the principle that we would contend. Wome have proved long since by their devotion to the work of th Church that it is not the higher offices they covet, but th right to serve and to exercise all their gifts in the service o God. The Church is surely doing a very serious thing i ignoring what may be a true vocation in women to the minist of the Church.

E. Rodgers.

THE ATONEMENT

By the Rev. Canon R. H. Kennett, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge.

'Because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father.' *Galatians* iv, 6.

IT is a remarkable fact that that aspect of the Christian faith which in popular teaching has commonly been most insisted on is either ignored in the Church's Creeds, or is dealt with quite summarily. The Apostles' Creed gives no reason for that which it bids us believe about our Lord Jesus Christ; that is to say, it does not attempt to explain why He was born and was crucified and rose again. The Nicene Creed states generally that the Incarnation with its sequel was 'for us men and for our salvation'; the *Quicunque Vult* limits this general statement by representing our salvation as the reason for the passion of our Lord, but does not attempt to explain how it could be furthered by His suffering.

But since the suffering of the righteous is a problem of which religious men are naturally impelled to seek a solution, it was inevitable that those who had believed in Christ should endeavour to find a reason for His passion. Christian thought could not long be contented with the mere affirmation that, though Jesus suffered death at the hands of wicked men, yet God raised Him from the dead. They felt that the death of Jesus could not be an inexplicable episode having no relation to that which preceded and followed it, and that no account of Him could be satisfactory which did not take into consideration His death.

And inasmuch as it was of Israel as concerning the flesh that Christ came, and He Himself had insisted that His teaching was the 'fulfilment,' the development, that is to say, of the highest prophetic teaching, Christians not unnaturally turned to the Old Testament in expectation of finding there foreshadowed the work of Christ. It must never be forgotten, however, that although the earliest disciples were Jews, the inter-

pretation of the Old Testament soon passed over to men of Gentile antecedents, who were apt superficially to imitate the Jewish use of the Old Testament with but little understanding of Jewish methods of quotation. A Jewish teacher could quote in illustration of a lesson any passage of the Old Testament regardless of its context, without being understood as intending to expound its *original* meaning; but where a Jew would rightly see only a superficial or a verbal resemblance, a Gentile was apt to suppose that a real parallel was intended. St. Augustine's famous dictum, 'Novum testamentum in vetere latet: vetus testamentum in novo patet,' is an example of the extreme exaggeration and distortion of our Lord's teaching about the 'fulfilment' of the Old Testament which has prevailed in the Christian Church, and which more than anything else has prevented men from seeing the true meaning of either Testament. Those who saw no discrepancy between the description of Jehovah in the second and third chapters of Genesis and our Lord's teaching about the Heavenly Father were not only unable to recognise the true character of that ancient folktale, but approached the study of the whole Bible with a prepossession towards a theory of Atonement from which, in modern times, a healthy sense of justice instinctively recoils. Before the days of Pentateuchal criticism, it was impossible to understand that the first chapter of Genesis was originally meant to supersede the second and third chapters; and accordingly the story of the Garden of Eden, literally understood, warped Christians' whole conception of God's relation to man. Christians were taught to believe not in a beneficent Creator Who rejoices in the creation which He has blessed, but rather in an arbitrary tyrant who not only punished severely a man and a woman for an act of disobedience which in these days would be regarded as so trifling a fault that few masters or mistresses would consider it adequate reason for dismissing a servant, but even exposed to the risk of never ending torture untold millions of their descendants, whose birth, it might have been supposed, He would have prevented rather than allow them to be born to such a fate. The punishment which the popular theory supposed Jehovah to have decreed for mankind was indeed one which might have appalled the cruellest savage who ever

exulted in the sufferings of his enemy; and thus, in view of other passages of Scripture which set forth the love of God, Christians represented Jehovah as making efforts to avert the full consequence of the doom which he had pronounced; on the one hand safeguarding His Divine prerogative by maintaining the letter of His arbitrary sentence on the first parents of the human race, and on the other seeking to avoid its most terrible effects.

The doctrine of the fall of man never permeated Jewish theology to the extent to which it has dominated Christian thought. The Jewish belief in Jehovah's exclusive covenant with Israel and in Israel's unique relation to Jehovah made that impossible: nevertheless the so-called Law of Moses, at least in many passages, and many of the narratives of the Old Testament—mainly in consequence of the incessant struggle against Canaanite superstitions and other pagan influences in the course of which the Law was developed—represent Jehovah as a God prone to wrath between Whom and His people there is always risk of a breach. There are, it is true, other voices in the Old Testament, in the Law as well as in the Prophets; voices which speak comfortably to humanity, and which are indeed fulfilled in the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; but the conception of God which is most prominent in the Law and in those portions of the Old Testament most closely related to it, and which finds expression in the greater part of the ritual, is of a God Who is ready relentlessly to cast off His people when they have offended Him, unless 'atonement' is made.

I have spoken of 'atonement,' because it is the word which is used in our English Bible, and because the term 'the Atonement' has been commonly employed to denote the means by which, in the words of a familiar hymn, we may look for 'Peace on earth, and mercy mild, God and sinners reconciled'; but the term 'the Atonement' is ambiguous, since in popular use the word 'atone' has lost its original meaning of setting at one; in popular phraseology we speak of atoning for a wrong, meaning thereby the doing of something in expiation of it or by way of compensation for it.

It will be well, therefore, briefly to consider in what sense the word 'atone' (Heb. כִּפֶּר) is used in the Old Testament. In

Exodus xxxii, 30, we read as follows: 'And it came to pass on the morrow' (that is, on the day after Moses' discovery of the golden calf and the indiscriminate massacre of the people which he then ordered) 'that Moses said unto the people, Ye have sinned a great sin: and now I will go up unto Jehovah; peradventure I shall make atonement.' The subsequent context gives no account of any act of atonement (in the popular sense of the word), but only of Moses' intercession for the people. It is obvious, therefore, that the writer who used the word rendered in English, 'I shall make atonement' (Heb. אכפרה did not understand the word as necessarily implying any act of expiation or any piacular offering.

What, then, did this word which we translate 'atone' originally denote? It is probable that its primary meaning is *covering*, and that it was used metaphorically to denote either the covering over of that which is offensive so that the injured party should not look at it, or else the covering over of his face or eyes by means of it, in which case, of course, the result would be the same. Thus in *Genesis* xxxii, 20, Jacob, who, in dread of Esau's wrath, has sent on before him a most valuable present, says: 'I will appease him with the present that goeth before me, and afterward I will see his face; peradventure he will accept me.' The words, 'I will appease him,' are a rendering of the Hebrew אכפרה פניו 'I will cover his face,' that is to say, 'I will so delight him with the big present, that he will not look at the wrong which I formerly did to him.' Similarly in *Deut.* xvi, 19, the taking of gifts by those who have to administer justice is forbidden for the reason that 'a gift doth blind the eyes of the wise, and pervert the words of the righteous.'

Owing to the fact that the Bible has commonly been treated as a book apart from all other literature, it has too often been read without such discrimination as would naturally be applied to non-canonical books. In time past, even if men have thought of questioning whether the presentation of Jehovah in any particular passage is in accordance with the highest teaching of the Prophets and of our Lord, they have commonly put away the question as savouring of irreverence. But when we subject the Old Testament to that consecrated criticism to which our Saviour

Himself has shown us the way, we cannot refuse to admit that in many passages Jehovah is presented to us as an arbitrary Oriental autocrat, and that the means which are employed to conciliate or to placate Him are precisely such as would be employed by those who have to deal with an irresponsible Sultan or Shah, or by a slave who goes in constant fear of his master's anger. Thus in the story of Moses' efforts to avert Jehovah's wrath from Israel, he is represented as using just those arguments which the Grand Vizier of an autocratic Sultan might employ. He urges Jehovah to consider His own reputation: 'Lord, why doth thy wrath wax hot against thy people, which thou hast brought forth out of the land of Egypt with great power and with a mighty hand? Wherefore should the Egyptians speak, saying, For evil did he bring them forth, to slay them in the mountains, and to consume them from the face of the earth?' (*Exodus* xxxii, 12). Similarly in this passage (*Numbers* xiv, 11): 'And Jehovah said unto Moses, How long will this people despise me? and how long will they not believe in me, for all the signs which I have wrought among them? I will smite them with the pestilence and disinherit them, and will make of thee a nation greater and mightier than they. And Moses said unto Jehovah, Then the Egyptians shall hear it; for thou broughtest up this people in thy might from among them; and they will tell it to the inhabitants of this land . . . . Now if thou shalt kill this people as one man, then the nations which have heard the fame of thee will speak, saying, Because Jehovah was not able to bring this people into the land which he sware unto them, therefore he hath slain them in the wilderness.'

But not only is Jehovah urged to consider his own reputation; even more popular and homely methods are employed to conciliate him. It must always be remembered that in almost the whole of the Old Testament every disaster or sorrow of any sort whatsoever is taken as a sign that the Divine favour has been withdrawn from those who suffer. Thus after the Flood, which was regarded as the most terrific example of Jehovah's wrath, Noah seeks to conciliate Him; and he employs precisely the method which Pharaoh's chief baker, for example, might have employed to placate the king, had it only been possible

after his imprisonment. Listen to this description: 'And Noah builded an altar unto Jehovah; and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar. And Jehovah smelled the sweet savour; and Jehovah said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake, for that the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth: neither will I again smite any more every thing living, as I have done.' Is not the effect here stated to have been produced on Jehovah by the sweet savour of the burnt meat precisely the same as that which is produced on the aged Isaac by the savoury meat which his soul loves, stimulating him to give a blessing superior to that which he would have given if he had partaken only of an ordinary dinner of herbs?

A like mode of thought finds expression in the words which David is represented as addressing to Saul (I *Samuel* xxvi, 19): 'If it be Jehovah that hath stirred thee up against me, let him smell an offering.'

I have quoted these passages, because I believe them to be a fair illustration of that idea which found expression in sacrifice. It is impossible to draw a sharp distinction between the ordinary sacrificial meal (the זבח) and the burnt offering. In the ritual of both, the fat and the blood, as containing the life of the victim in its most potent form, were reserved exclusively for the god; only, whereas in the ordinary sacrifice the worshippers were allowed to partake of the flesh—which in primitive ritual had been eaten raw, and was thus regarded as also containing the life, though in a less potent form—in the burnt offering (the form of sacrifice adopted in cases where there was reason to fear the Divine displeasure), the worshipper deemed it expedient to forgo his share, which was therefore, with the fat and the blood, made over to the god.

Thus the root idea of sacrifice seems to have been not to expiate sin, but to conciliate God and to induce Him to change His purpose: just as Moses is represented as endeavouring to dissuade Jehovah from that which He has declared Himself about to do. I do not mean that such an idea was necessarily in the mind of all those who took part in the offering of sacrifice, especially in the later period of the Temple's history. It is

probable that the great majority of those who were engaged in the sacrificial ritual of the Jewish Law did not trouble themselves about the *rationale* of sacrifice. They believed that it put things right, or kept them right, between themselves and their God, but they were contented not to ask how it served this purpose. There is a common tendency in mankind to retain ritual long after the ideas which it originally expressed have been given up; and in such circumstances the ritual is either left unexplained, or else more or less desperate and unsatisfactory explanations are given to justify it.

It must not be forgotten that the great Prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries before Christ, some of whom at least lived before any part of the Pentateuch had been written, definitely repudiated sacrifice as an ordinance of Jehovah, and affirmed that it was not offered by the Israelites while they were in the wilderness. These Prophets demand nothing in the way of expiation as a condition of at-one-ment between Israel and Jehovah, but merely that Israel shall repent of sins and shall serve Jehovah wholeheartedly.

I have said that sacrifice—including sin-offerings—was not originally offered with a view of expiating sin, but rather of propitiating an offended god; it may however be objected that the idea of expiation is definitely set forth in the Law. Thus in *Numbers* xxxv, which deals both with unintentional manslaughter and wilful murder, there is no denunciation of the desire for vengeance, no prohibition of the blood feud, but the strange enactment that the innocent manslayer, though he may not be handed over to the avenger of blood, shall forfeit his life if he leave his asylum before the death of the high priest. For the wilful murderer on the other hand the death penalty is prescribed, and there is no exemption. The law on the subject concludes as follows: 'So ye shall not pollute the land wherein you are: for blood, it polluteth the land; and no expiation can be made for the land for the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it.' Here it must be noted that the words 'no expiation can be made,' if a consistent rendering of the Hebrew had been adopted, would have been translated, 'atonement shall not be made,' or, more literally, 'no covering shall be effected' (לֹא יכפר).

Now in order to understand these words rightly, it is important that they should not be isolated from their context. As I have said, the law makes no attempt to put down the blood feud, and actually allows the kinsman of the person accidentally slain to kill the innocent manslayer, if the latter should leave the city of refuge before the death of the high priest; it assumes as lawful and right that the kinsman of a person accidentally killed shall cherish towards the innocent cause of his death vengeance which can only be satisfied by the shedding of his blood.

We have seen what essentially human emotions—not always exalted ones—are ascribed to Jehovah in some parts of the Old Testament; and in the law which I have just quoted we find Him represented as actuated by the same desire for vengeance which finds expression in the blood feud. This law finds a remarkable illustration in the story of 2 *Samuel* xxi. We are there told that for three successive years in the days of David there was a famine, and that Jehovah's oracle declared that this famine was due to the bloodguiltiness which rested upon the land in consequence of a massacre of the Gibeonites ordered by Saul. The Gibeonites have therefore invoked a curse upon the land, a curse which is, apparently, upheld by Jehovah. David therefore asks them what will put things right between them and Israel; they refuse however to accept any compensation in silver or gold, insisting on their pound of flesh, that is to say their right to carry out the law of the blood feud. 'They said unto the king, The man that consumed us, and that devised against us, that we should be destroyed from remaining in any of the borders of Israel, let seven men of his sons be delivered unto us, and we will hang them up unto Jehovah in Gibeah of Saul the chosen of Jehovah.' David agreed to the Gibeonites' savage demand for vengeance: he put to death seven innocent men of Saul's family, but this was done, not so much to expiate Saul's crime, as to satisfy the Gibeonites' vengeance, and to induce them to desist from cursing his land. David's action was regarded as in accordance with Jehovah's will; and the story concludes with the words, 'and after that God was intreated for the land.'

I have called attention to what is implied in the foregoing passages of the Old Testament, in order to clear the ground for the understanding of the teaching of Christ. I desired to make it clear that it is 'according to the Law'—not according to the Prophets or the Gospel—that 'all things are cleansed with blood, and apart from shedding of blood is no remission.' Our blessed Saviour never affirmed that the shedding of blood was an essential preliminary to pardon. He drew no illustration of His saving work from the sin offering of the Jewish altar. It is remarkable that we never hear of Him in connection with the sacrificial ritual of the Temple except when He was an infant not six weeks old. There is no record of His keeping the Day of Atonement. He never compared Himself, so far as we know, either to the goat of the sin-offering or to the so-called scapegoat. The whole of His teaching, so far from being merely the coping stone of the sacrificial system, is the direct negation of it. He said to the sick of the palsy, who in accordance with the common teaching of that time would regard his malady as a sign of the Divine displeasure, 'My boy (τέκνον), your sins are forgiven you'; and He says not a word of any expiatory or piacular offering. He says, 'Suffer the little children to come unto me,' and He blesses them, without so much as hinting that they can be recipients of His blessing only if something first be done to expiate the sin in which they are supposed to have been conceived and born. And, most wonderful of all, He says to His disciples, 'After this manner pray ye, Our Father Which art in heaven.' Does a father, even an earthly father, need propitiation to induce him to forgive his children? Does he turn away from a repentant child, unless that child can in some way expiate, or give compensation for, the wrong which he has done? In that beautiful story of a father's love which the Saviour told in illustration of the Fatherhood of God, there is no hint of a demand for expiation of the son's ingratitude; while the son was still a great way off, his father saw him, and was moved with compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him.

Do not misunderstand me. I do not preach an easy-going God, a God who simply undoes the wrong which has been done

without effort or suffering on the part of him who has done it. The prodigal son had his father's fullest forgiveness, but that forgiveness did not do away with the hard effort which he had subsequently to make in order to settle down to steady honest work.

On the night of his return home the younger son was far happier than his elder brother; but when the feasting was over, and there was work to be done in the vineyard or in the harvest field, the elder son had the easier task, though we may well suppose that the prodigal's gratitude enabled him to endure what would otherwise have been to him intolerably irksome.

Those who have gone out of the right way, when they repent, are not where they would have been, if they had always continued in the right path. They must retrace their steps, and the return uphill is harder than the previous downhill course. Moreover, wherever there has been wrong of any sort, things can only be put right by effort involving suffering on the part of those who are in no wise responsible for the wrong. Mankind can only be delivered from the bondage of ignorance and superstition and sin by the martyrdom, *i.e.* the witness borne whether by life or death, of the missionaries of the truth. The Son of man, who, be it remembered, represents all the people of the saints of the Most High, in order to bring about the Kingdom of Heaven, must abjure the hope of being ministered to, and must rather minister, giving life itself to free the many from the thraldom into which they have been brought by their sinfulness and weakness and lack of the knowledge of the truth.

But it will perhaps be objected, did not the Apostles affirm that our salvation was achieved by the blood of Christ? and if so, can we rule out of our inquiry as to the meaning of His passion all comparison with the blood ritual of the altar? In the first place, then, we must inquire what is meant by 'blood' in the Bible; and as soon as we formulate the question, we see that the answer to it is not an altogether simple one. In all sacrificial ritual 'blood' denotes the *life* of the victim which was regarded not as being annihilated but rather assimilated by the god on whose altar it was presented. But the word 'blood' is also used in an entirely different sense simply to denote *violent death*. Thus St. Paul speaks (*Acts* xxii, 20) of

the shedding of the blood of the martyr Stephen, although Stephen's death was not caused by effusion of blood. The same Apostle also says that God set forth Christ Jesus 'to be a propitiation, through faith, by His Blood.' Here there is no reference to Jewish sacrificial ritual, from which indeed St. Paul desired to keep the Galatians aloof. It is important also to remember that the word 'propitiation' does not imply that the Apostle imagined that Christ had brought an angry god to a more gracious mood. In Hebrew metaphor—and St. Paul was a Hebrew of Hebrews—attention is generally concentrated not on the manner of an action but on its effect. Jehovah, for example, is said to have 'redeemed' Israel from the land of Egypt, but so far as the manner of that deliverance went, it was not a *redemption*, inasmuch as it was carried out not by the payment of a price, but with a mighty hand and with a stretched out arm. Similarly a Hebrew uses the word which is commonly rendered 'covenant' in cases where anything of the nature of a bargain or agreement is absolutely impossible. Thus God is represented as 'establishing his covenant' not only with Noah and his descendants, but also with 'the fowl, the cattle, and every beast of the earth' (*Genesis* ix, 9*f*), and as 'making a covenant for' Israel 'with the beasts of the field, and with the fowls of the heaven, and with the creeping things of the ground' (*Hosea* ii, 18, *cf.*; Isaiah xxviii, 15; Job v, 22). Obviously no one ever dreamed of supposing that wild animals, or death, or hell could be parties to any agreement. In all these passages the idea is simply of *immunity from harm or dread* such as exists between those who have actually made an agreement not to injure one another. According to Hebrew phraseology, therefore, Christ is a 'propitiation,' forasmuch as He has accomplished for us peace with God in teaching us to cry, 'Abba, Father': just as those who are at the mercy of an earthly potentate are freed from fear when he has been propitiated.

And this conviction of our peace with the Heavenly Father has been brought about by the 'blood,' that is the violent death, or, as we should rather put it in modern speech, by the martyrdom of Jesus Christ the faithful witness. Jesus gave his life, suffered martyrdom, both in the toil of His ministry and in His

agony before and during His crucifixion, that He might free us from the bondage of the fear of death and from the debasing superstition which arises from ignorance of the true character of God. Where could we find a better example of perfect salvation than in Him Who in apparent failure of His life's work, deserted by His followers, in the overwhelming shame and agony of the cross, could nevertheless keep as an anchor of the soul sure and steadfast His conviction of the unalterable love of God? In the words, 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit' we see a faith which has battled against forces apparently irresistible and has won through to victory. Here is the witness of Jesus Christ; if we have faith to believe it, we are at one with our Father by the blood, that is to say, the martyrdom of our blessed Lord. He was delivered up to the death of the cross, not to satisfy the letter of a legal covenant with God, but in consequence of the sins of men. If we desire to find an illustration of His death, we must look not to the scaffold or gallows or other machinery of judicially inflicted suffering; nor yet to the grim ritual of the Jewish altar; but rather to the great company which no man can number out of every nation and of all tribes and peoples and tongues, who for the right against the wrong, for the truth against every sort of lie, for the love of God against human hate, have braved tribulation, and by their death no less than by their lives have resisted the evil which would otherwise have brought mankind into hopeless slavery. In the death of Jesus in witness of His glorious Gospel the noble army of martyrs, which is in truth the blessed company of all faithful people, have found a proof of the love of God which nothing can withstand. St. Paul's great shout of triumph all down the ages has echoed through the Christian Church.

> 'If God is for us, who is against us? He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not also with Him freely give us all things? Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation or anguish or persecution, or famine or nakedness or peril or sword? . . . Nay in all these things we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us. For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.'

BOOK REVIEWS

A PROTESTANT CONFESSIONAL.*

Nowadays the expression 'personal evangelization' instinctively brings to our mind the labours of those objectionable but well-meaning persons who accost us in tramcars or on railway stations with the ambiguous question, 'Are you saved?'; and the words 'sudden conversion' suggest the revival meeting with its hectic emotionalism, frantic resolutions, and depressing aftermath. Mr. Begbie's latest volume will, we trust, redeem both the above-mentioned phrases and will give fresh hope to those who expect little from new movements in religion.

The originator of this new movement in personal religion is an *apparently* commonplace middle-aged American who, at his own wish, remains concealed in Mr. Begbie's book under the initials 'F.B.' One despairs of describing this unique personality to those who have not had the happiness of meeting him, as many did in Oxford last summer. 'F.B.' is as quiet and unobtrusive in manner and appearance as he is magnetic (one uses this adjective advisedly) in conversation. His power of rapid sympathetic penetration is unique. He has natural gifts which few possess, yet gifts which have been enhanced a thousandfold by long years of daily contemplation in the still hours of the early morning.

The reader will not therefore be surprised to learn that 'F.B.' does not believe in dealing with men in the mass; as he himself says, 'It's no use dropping eye-lotion from a second-story window.' He is not himself hostile to institutional religion, but he is keenly alive to its weaknesses. Religion is for him primarily an affair of triangles: God, yourself, and the other person, and from this last corner of the triangle there ought to spring another, and so on *ad infinitum*. 'F.B.' has done much in America and China among theological students and missionaries. His work lies, in fact, almost entirely among University men. He penetrates at once to the cause of ineffectiveness. Why is it that so many apparently good parsons and church workers cut so little ice? Why is it that 'conversion' is a term so little heard nowadays except in the mouths of a certain section of Protestants?

'F.B.'s theory is that no amount of good qualities can ever make up for the disastrous effect of a divided personality. Ineffectiveness in religion is due to sin and nothing else. To quote Mr Begbie: 'When a man has heard of "F.B." or has met him in a fellow-undergraduate's room goes to see "F.B." in private, he usually begins by a statement of his theological difficulties. "F.B." hears him out. He never interrupts. He waits patiently and quite unemotionally, his eyes absorbed in studying the eyes of his visitor, until the young man's mind has emptied itself of all its intellectual objections to Christianity . . . Then "F.B." makes this remark: "It isn't any intellectual difficulty which is keeping you from God. It is sin. You are a ——." It may be anything from the very worst and most deadly order of sinners to the victim of a bad habit reckoned by some people to be comparatively harmless. In nine cases out of ten the diagnosis is true.' But, as Mr. Begbie goes on to point out, it is not the correct diagnosis which is so important. The point is that he brushes aside all the mental excuses of a distressed spirit and

* *Life Changers*, by Harold Begbie. Mills & Boon, 1923. Price 5s.

confronts it with the cold and deadly truth that it is sin, a sin which it refuses to give up, does not give up, and will not give up without a tremendous struggle which is locking the door on its natural peace, its natural happiness, and its natural power. It is difficult to estimate how far 'F.B.' allows for the existence of genuine intellectual objections. We ourselves are inclined to believe that such objections, *sin apart,* prove generally in practice to be but slight obstacles to Christian service. We have only to look at Dr. Schweitzer's splendid work in equatorial Africa to see the true significance of *genuine intellectual* difficulties to Christianity. As to the ineffectiveness of the personality which is not unified, we have no need of the psychologists' instructions to be convinced of its truth.

It is interesting to compare 'F.B.'s methods with the Catholic Confessional. No religion can be of any permanent value which does not provide some means of confession. The Salvationist recognises the value of Confession before man as much as any Roman or Anglo-Catholic. Among Catholics the Sacrament of Penance is inextricably associated with the grace of absolution pronounced by the priest who at ordination receives the power 'to absolve all sinners who truly repent.' The Confession must be a full one. It must include alike the big ones and the small, those which weigh on the penitent's mind and those which do not. Careful preparation is accordingly needed and true repentance made before the visit to the priest. In the confession itself the frequency of the sins mentioned and any aggravating circumstances must all be told to the best of the penitent's ability. The priest may also cross-question if he thinks it necessary. In the case of a first confession a complete review of one's whole life is necessary; for subsequent confession only a review of the period since resort was last made to this sacrament. In the Roman Church and among certain Anglicans regular confession is commanded as part of the normal discipline of the Christian life. The priest is bound under a strict seal to reveal nothing told him in the confessional, and the penitent is supposed to observe a like reticence with regard to the priest's personal advice to himself. The advice given by a properly trained confessor is, of course, very valuable, and the Catholic Church has slowly built up in the course of centuries a great accumulation of important teaching on the subject of sin which in certain aspects is receiving whole-hearted confirmation from psychologists. The law of reversed effort was found out by the priest before the scientist had begun to investigate the mind and its workings.

'F.B.'s methods are at once like and unlike those of the Catholic Confessional. He regards confession as most important. Not only is it essential for the man himself, but it may often be necessary for him who would win another's soul to reveal frankly his own past shortcomings. In the hands of 'F.B.' this mutual exchange of confidences is effected with rare tact which leads to but few mistakes, but his disciples are not always so successful. Confidences of this kind must never be forced, as they inevitably are if the would-be surgeon of souls is too ready to expose his own inmost recesses to the view of others. On the other hand, 'F.B.' is undoubtedly right in insisting on complete readiness to put *all* the cards on the table as an essential for the man who is to win others. 'F.B.' is not much concerned with the many *little* failings which help to keep people ineffective. He is out primarily for *the* sin; the real divider of the personality, the Mammon which is being served on an equality with God. There is no formal preparation for the confessions which he hears. Often enough it is 'F.B.' and not his penitent who lays bare the sin which is

blinding and paralysing an outward 'good' life. It is unfair to 'F.B.' to say that he is pre-occupied with discovering sexual sins. Selfishness, or an unforgiving temper, or pride, may be as deadly a foe as any sexual weakness. But while we deprecate most strongly the idea that sexual vice is *the* sin, we cannot state too emphatically our belief that it is widespread, and that organized religion largely fails to tackle it effectively and to deliver men from its tyranny. There are few sins which lower men more in their own eyes, even if it is not the worst sort of sin. It should never be approached as a problem in itself, but always be treated in relation to the larger issues of service, and harmony with the Will of God.

Again, with 'F.B.' there is no formal pronouncement of absolution. The unmasking of the sin is sufficient without that, and here, we suppose, psychologists would agree, while recognising a further if slighter value for *some* in the Absolution. There is no formal seal, but no one who has met 'F.B.' will require that. We have noticed sometimes that, in recounting some story of another to illustrate a point, he will preface his remarks by the statement that the subject of the story freely tells the story himself. 'F.B.' needs no penalty of 'irregularity' hanging over his head.

The strong points of 'F.B.'s method of unifying the divided personality, are of course obvious to any student of religion and psychology. The informality of these interviews is perhaps their greatest asset. Many who would never go near a Catholic priest can be touched in this way. There is no need of formal preparation; the cure can be effected anywhere, and the patients can be reached through the ordinary contacts of friendship. On the other hand, when lesser men adopt 'F.B.'s methods we cannot but feel the advantage of the Catholic system. Indeed, we are brought right up against the fundamental cleavage between the Protestant and Catholic systems, the former giving scope to the individual of parts, while leaving us at the mercy of mediocrities, the latter making the minimum of demand upon the individual and thus ensuring a general level of efficiency at the price of real spontaneity and originality.

Those who read Mr. Begbie's book will find the two opening chapters as well as the last one particularly interesting, showing as they do the author's attitude towards 'F.B.' and the relation of 'F.B.'s work to his theology. Mr. Begbie has no difficulty in showing that 'F.B.'s work is really quite independent of his peculiar theological tenets, particularly of his 'transactional' view of the Atonement. In the last chapter Mr. Begbie relates the whole question to the problem of immortality as approached from the point of view of science, and in particular from the point of view of evolution.

The bulk of the book is taken up with personal narratives which give much valuable and interesting material. They show how 'F.B.' reacts on many different types of undergraduates, both British and American.

There are two main criticisms of this book which we feel compelled to make. The first is this. We cannot but feel that the personal narratives (included by permission, of course) are in some cases lacking in discretion. No one can object to anyone making public their own shortcomings, but, from what we believe is a sincere desire to give all the relevant circumstances, reflections on other persons are included, and insufficient care has been taken to disguise the identity of the subjects of these personal narratives. There are so many indiscreet books of personal reminiscences written nowadays, and so many novels full of real characters very thinly disguised, that we are sorry that Mr. Begbie, even with the best and highest motives, should add to their number.

Our second criticism is this: Is it not possible for Mr. Begbie to avoid journalese? Frequent 'purple passages' in a writer who has the ability to use his words with such telling effect are unpleasant at any time, and in a serious book of this kind strike a most discordant note. O.F.C.

ROADS TO UNITY.

Size must always be a poor criterion of value, and the two small volumes on Reunion which come to us from the Bishop of Pretoria and Mr. Malcolm Spencer respectively, and which are intended by the publishers for joint consideration, possess an importance far greater than their very modest bulk might seem to suggest. Bishop Talbot's book was written before the Lambeth Conference of 1920, and in the days of his chaplaincy at Balliol. Mr. Spencer writes with Lambeth behind him, prompted by an ardent desire that the Bishops' Appeal to All Christian People shall have its full effect as a great contribution to the cause of unity. Both men are singularly well qualified for their task. In the writings of both there is the same manifest desire for Reunion as not merely highly expedient but vitally necessary; the same frank recognition of difficulties; the same intelligent sympathy, born of wide experience, with points of view other than their own; the same adventurous willingness to attempt fresh methods of approach.

The Bishop writes convincingly of the common task confronting a divided Church. In the past a shifting of emphasis away from things central to the mind of Christ has led to a wrong perspective and an unpleasing acquiescence on the part of rival sects in each others' failure. Now, with the re-instatement of the Kingdom of God in the place of rightful supremacy as the foremost concern of the historical Jesus, denominational selfishness will be acknowledged for the wretched thing it is. Much of the mischief of sectarianism has arisen, in the opinion of the Bishop, from the Protestant worship of an infallible Bible. The facile assumption that the Book was everything, the Church nothing, has meant a readiness to 'hive off' with the treasures of Christ, a failure to see the peril of division, an unnatural 'separation of the truth of the Gospel from the fellowship of the one Body of Christ.'

Infallibilities, we are assured, are dead, and the Bishop rejoices over their demise, for they have 'acted as substitutes for the guidance of the Spirit. They have been the brakes which human infirmity has applied to the advance of divine truth . . . They have led to the entrenchment of an army that should be on the march . . . Their departure is the signal for the return of the great days of the Spirit.' It is upon the work of the Spirit that Christian thought must concentrate. If the gifts of the same Spirit are manifested in the separated parts of the one Body, the question whether the possessors of the different gifts can continue to live independently of one another becomes imperative. Only the conviction of a common need can bring Reunion. The ideals of Catholic and Evangelical, of Anglican and Free Churchman, are complementary rather than antagonistic. Strength and weakness are alike evident in every group. Therefore complacency with the *status quo* is the one unpardonable sin. With ambitious schemes for interchange of pulpits the Bishop has little sympathy. What is of much greater importance is friendly conference

* *Thoughts on Unity*, by Neville S. Talbot. S.C.M. 1920. Pp. 122. Price 3s. 6d.
Impasse or Opportunity? by Malcolm Spencer. S.C.M. 1922. Pp. 120. Price 3s.

upon points of divergence, an interchange of ideals, and perhaps also 'an interchange of congregations.'

Mr. Spencer writes as a Congregationalist possessed of what might almost be termed Anglo-Catholic sympathies. His book, published in 1922, is written with a definite reference to the Lambeth Conference, and is the product of a time when the first optimism occasioned by the Bishops' pronouncement had begun to fade. Mr. Spencer is eager that the merits of that pronouncement shall receive adequate recognition. At the same time he shows himself no less keenly aware of its shortcomings, and his fear is lest the spirit of unity, undoubtedly in the ascendant in 1920, may be frittered away in disappointment and criticism before it has achieved any goal. He refers to 'the strangely compounded impression' created by the Appeal, 'of a magnificently Christian utterance leading up to the position of the gravest difficulty, if not of actual *impasse*.' But this disturbing possibility of *impasse* must be avoided at all costs. Accordingly our author desires to emphasise as markedly as possible the clear gains which have resulted from the Lambeth Appeal. And first and foremost stress is laid upon the Appeal's frank recognition of the value of non-episcopal ministries, methods and ideals. On the other hand, in common with Nonconformists generally, Mr. Spencer is far from satisfied with the Bishops' attitude to the questions of Interchange of Pulpits, Ordination and Intercommunion, and he records his dissatisfaction in unequivocal terms.

The book is primarily an appeal for mutual explanation, understanding and sympathy. We are asked to concentrate resolutely upon points of real divergence, not at all for the purpose of maintaining barriers, but rather in the frank recognition that here lies the crux of our problem. No mere interchange of compliments, no congratulatory assurances of mutual respect and admiration, no oratorical allusions to the large measure of common ground which already exists, will meet the case. There must be real sympathy, a resolute desire to understand, a genuine sharing of spiritual experience. And with this aim in view Mr. Spencer has attempted the enumeration of Catholic and Free Church 'values,' none of which may be safely ignored or depreciated in a united Church. While the Free Churches, he tells us, have stood for the supreme importance of the individual soul, the spiritual value of the Christian group, and the paramount significance of a prophetic tradition, Catholicism has tended rather to emphasise that which is common and universal, the necessity of a dogmatic creed as the safeguard of orthodoxy, and the official and representative character of a ministry episcopally ordained.

Of the purpose of Creeds, the efficacy of Sacraments, and the value of Orders, Mr. Spencer writes with penetrating judgment. For him a creed is less a test of orthodoxy than a profession of dynamic faith. Sacraments, again, if they are not to be harmful, must be freed from all suspicion of magical potency, and Episcopacy must cease to carry with it any theories of specialised and exclusive reservoirs of divine grace. The book concludes with an appeal for what Mr. Spencer calls adult co-education, 'the co-education not of the sexes but of the sects.' Here, as everywhere, education of the right type will provide the solution of our problems. Only let Christians get together to think, work and pray in common in the spirit of love and with a whole-hearted desire for fellowship and understanding, and Reunion must ultimately be achieved. For, as Mr. Elihu Root, the famous American jurist, has said, speaking of international differences, 'Every controversy can be settled where on both sides there is the will to settlement.'

W. M. P.

DIET AND DEVOTION.*

The Americans are nothing if they are not practical: 'The minister may well order his eating with reference to the delivery of his sermon. . . . Much of the religious apathy in country places in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has been attributed to the prevalent habit of serving baked beans for supper on Saturday night. There are homes where the beans are served up again for Sunday breakfast. It is a well-nigh impossible task for a preacher filled to the throat with baked beans to preach to a congregation similarly filled and accomplish the full and appropriate measure of spiritual result.'

This and much similar advice is given by Dean Brown to his readers. We are disposed to feel that this side of the business has been too much neglected; for the spiritual has, at least in our present state, its basis in the physical; and though we need not say with the materialist philosopher that Man *is* his stomach, yet it is only too true that this organ has its effects upon our mental efficiency, and even upon our spiritual condition. This has perhaps been the failing of certain types of Protestantism, that, while realising that an undue preoccupation with wine, women, and song is deleterious to religion, they have overlooked the possibility that a surfeit of baked beans or suet puddings may be the same. The old Evangelicals are said invariably to have kept a good table.

What we particularly like about this book is that it takes preaching seriously, without indulging in the cant which in some circles is considered indispensable. And some recent American tendencies are repudiated:—

> 'If you undertake to compete with the theatre or the vaudeville show, or the moving pictures, in furnishing entertainment, you will be left behind. The amusement vendors have vast amounts of money to spend. They have been studying the entertainment business for years, while you were studying your Bible. Their mastery of their subject will make your knowledge of it seem like the crude notions of an amateur.'

Nor is the preacher there to compete with the lecture platform, or with the scientific or commercial or political expert:

> 'You are not there primarily to impart larger stores of learning to men touching their own particular lines of interest. You are there chiefly to impart spiritual life. Your sermon, if it is really worthy of being preached, has grown in direct fashion out of your own spiritual life. If you are preaching on faith, you preach as a man who cherishes faith himself and has put it to the test. If you preach on hope, you preach as a man who is "saved by hope." If you discourse on love, you do it out of a heart honestly controlled by love for God and for man . . . When you enter your pulpit, you are there to make people feel the presence of God. And here you have a field to yourself with little or no competition.'

This is indeed a thoroughly practical, and yet thoroughly religious and idealistic book. Young clergymen, especially, would do well to read it. As for the old—after the age of forty one will have either learnt all this already, or be incapable of learning it.

J.C.H.

* *The Art of Preaching*, by Dean Charles R. Brown. Pp. 250. The Macmillan Co., 1922. Price 8s. net.

LA JOIE DE VIVRE AND EDUCATION.*

Some twenty years ago Miss Margaret Macmillan denounced the traditional repressive methods of educating young children. The present volume is a re-written version of her manifesto of 1904. Here she describes her open-air 'nursery school,' and elaborates her views of child-nature. It is a bright picture that she draws; and the book, written with sincerity, enthusiasm, and knowledge, is a tonic for depressed souls. It breathes the true prophetic spirit of rational idealism.

We may leave to the educational journals all discussion of Miss Macmillan's methods, we are concerned rather with some *obiter dicta* which bear upon the problems of religious education. 'Two shadows,' we read on page 145, 'fall on the school—the shadow of the cloister (which removes it from the great world) and the shadow of the State, which takes the teacher's mind off his great work, hems him in with many rules, regulations, ledgers and official red tape.' Thus Miss Macmillan is against both forms of tyranny, that of the clergyman and that of the petty bureaucrat. As for the former of these, the financial stress in most parishes is such that the reign of the clericalist is almost over. For good or ill, the end of Church Schools is in sight; and it remains to be seen whether the pedagogues will profit from this extinction of rivalry among their oppressors. It is sometimes better to serve two masters than one, especially if they are at daggers drawn, for the dissentions of tyrants are freedom's opportunity.

Another passage is of extraordinary interest, especially to those who, on Sundays, have vainly attempted to interest scripture-hardened children in the Bible narratives. They know them all already, and (what is worse) they know them off by rote.

> 'A class of eight-year-olds were once put into my hands. They had had no religious instruction (*O fortunatos*!), had never heard or read any of the Gospels; in short, were virgin soil as regards all religion. We began by reading the Gospels every morning as a preparation for all other kinds of occupations. There was no dogmatic teaching at all. Nothing, indeed, in the way of teaching, but a little help at times towards fuller dramatic presentation. The reading became a kind of Passion playing at times; some colour and life were given as well as might be to the great pictures. Nothing was done or said to weaken the power of the Gospel story (as distinct from its meaning). The results were strange, and certainly unexpected. A new energy and joy seemed to take possession of even the duller children. Some of these were transformed. The joy of the new experience made them eager to continue. They read on and on—the teacher remonstrating, and at length forcibly closing the books. All the children were changed henceforward. They no longer wanted to have things made easier, but rather to enjoy the sense of triumph in mastering even dull as well as difficult things' (p. 181).

This passage seems to indicate that there is more to be said for 'simple Bible teaching' than is sometimes admitted, especially if the teacher be gifted with that insight into the subject, and into the minds and hearts of the children, which is so essential. It is customary in some circles to despise all teaching which is not cut-and-dried, dogmatic, and 'definite,' and to impart 'religious knowledge' in hard, indigestible, but strictly rectangular, fragments. This ideal of instruction is just one of those weeds of prejudice which may safely be eradicated from the field of religious education.

J.C.H.

* *Education through the Imagination*, by Margaret Macmillan. Pp. 207. George Allen & Unwin, 1923. Price 6s. net.

FOR THE PLAIN MAN.*

It would be a custom not unfruitful of results if a number of plain citizens were to devote some of those winter evenings which are now sacred to bridge or *ennui* to an exposition, upon paper, of their various philosophies of life. The product might not in every case find, or even deserve to find, a publisher; but the number of people with moderately well-thought-out ideas would increase, and the present prestige of dogmatism, both political, theological, social and educational, would decline.

Though we are far from suggesting that Professor Widgery is an amateur in philosophy, his book is such as might have been produced by any enlightened and well-informed mind meditating upon the practical problems, and the ultimate significance, of life. The book is indeed, he tells us, the outcome of conversations held with one of the more enlightened native rulers in India. Possibly the average Englishman, who is not without his prejudices, might discover in Professor Widgery's social, economic, and ethical views, an undue flavour of liberalism. Yet things may have moved faster than the reviewer (who is a clergyman, and thus cut off from unembarrassed intercourse with his fellow-men) has been aware of.

With the views expressed in the chapter on *Religious Values* we find ourselves in general agreement:

> 'Religious fervour has led to the ascription of a number of attributes to the Divine Being, such as omnipotence, omniscience, infinity, eternity, all goodness, immortality, perfection. Whether the ascription of these attributes is a necessity of the individual's religious experience must ultimately be left to each individual to decide for himself. I wish simply to record for myself that these attributes do not at all appear to be necessary for my religious experience' (p. 252).

If 'all goodness' and 'perfection' were omitted from this list, we might be disposed to agree; yet it is a superficial psychology which sees no value for humanity in ideas of eternity and immortality. 'O Thou who changest not!' is a *cri du coeur,* and not a theological artificiality. We regret, too, the omission from this list of *expurganda* the word 'impassibility.' As Feuerbach said, 'Theology denies that God can suffer, but in so doing it denies the possibility of religion.' What is true in Professor Widgery's contention is that *quod supra nos est, nihil est nobis,* that is, a God who inspires us with no *human* emotions, has no interest for us, does not concern us, is actually *nothing* to us.

The following passage (p. 265), however, indicates that our author understands where religion has its source:

> 'At the root of religion is undoubtedly this music of the heart. One feels its chords touched most by the great powers of Nature, the expansiveness of the sea, the vast snow-capped peaks, the quietness of a lake, the songs of birds and the colours of the flowers. Another is attuned to the deepest tones of the eternal by the perception of the pitiable, the terrific suffering of humanity, its wanderings in error and sin . . . To some the divine becomes apparent in the lights and shades of feeling aroused by the music of the great musicians. Yet to how many has the path of religion been opened by the personal influence of prophet or saint!'

A profound observation follows:—

> 'A strain of pessimism has been present in all these great religious leaders [*i.e.* the founders of the great religions]: and it is a factor in almost all deep religious life. But the pessimism is one

* *Outlines of a Philosophy of Life,* by Alban G. Widgery, M.A. Pp. xxiv and 318. Williams & Norgate, 1923. Price 7s. 6d. net.

implying a failure of the lower types of value solely to satisfy, an insufficiency of returns for activity spent on the personal gratification of the senses.'

Schopenhauer based his approval of Christianity upon its pessimism; and in a real sense it may be said to be based on the book of *Ecclesiastes*. Life filled with the lower values is 'vanity.' 'Whoso sees not the vanity of the world is himself very vain,' wrote Pascal. Yet to turn from the world is a gospel of despair, and of selfishness; the *Imitatio* is wrong. May we not cultivate the higher values here and now—*i.e.* 'live eternal life in the midst of time'? This is indeed the moral of our author's book. J.C.H.

PRAYERS FOR BOYS.

When Justice fled from the earth, so Vergil believed, she left the last traces of her footsteps in country places and among country people,

extrema per illos
Justitia excedens terris vestigia fecit.

When Christianity forsakes humanity, if ever that day comes, her last shelter will have been not the Church, but the school. The schoolmaster who is intent on the formation of character recognises the need for the Christian Religion in its most practical form. Hence there is a vitality, a virility, a practicality, about a sound pedagogue's religion which is really refreshing. *Unconventional Prayers for Boys*,* by A. G. Grenfell, is a good example of this.

The Headmaster of King William's College, Isle of Man, writes thus of the book:—

> 'I should like to give your Book of Prayers a "God Speed." It is a great idea. There is plenty of Religion among the young, but in the fluid, amorphous state of public opinion they are getting very little guidance. No one has yet succeeded in putting their feelings to them in language they can understand. You are doing so. After reading a few of your compositions at House Prayers, I asked an intelligent boy of 15 how he liked them. He answered "Immensely"; and so does everyone.'

This seems to us to be a book that should be useful to parents as well as to schoolmasters. H. D. A. M.

* *Unconventional Prayers for Boys*, by A. G. Grenfell, published by Philip & Tacey, 69–79 High Street, Fulham, S.W.6. Price 2s. 6d. net.

CORRESPONDENCE

PRAYER BOOK REVISION.

SIR, TO THE EDITOR OF *The Modern Churchman*.

In view of the fact that the psychic experiences and researches of the past fifty years have shown:

(1) That the mortal body of a man does not rise again after death;
(2) That it is the spirit body, or spiritual body, which 'rises,' or rather is set free from the mortal body;
(3) That this resurrection, or separation from the mortal, takes place immediately, or very soon, after death, and not at some remote period termed 'the last day';

and seeing that these statements cannot be effectively controverted, I propose the following amendments and alterations in the Book of Common Prayer, with a view to correcting the eschatological errors which it now contains.

Article IV should be deleted in its present form, and the following substituted :—

'The spiritual body of Christ was set free from the mortal body at death, and did manifest itself on the third day; temporarily overlaying itself with grosser matter, and thus materialised, becoming visible, audible, and tangible to the disciples. On de-materialising it vanished out of their sight. In this spiritual body Christ ascended into the heavens, and there liveth.'

The Apostles' Creed.

Instead of 'Resurrection of the body' print 'Resurrection of the spiritual body.'

The Athanasian Creed.

Delete 'at whose coming,' and print 'All men rise again in their spiritual bodies, and shall give an account,' &c.

Infant Baptism and The Visitation of the Sick.

The expression 'Resurrection of the flesh' in both these offices should be changed to 'Resurrection of the spiritual body.'

Burial of the Dead.

Instead of 'Yet in my flesh shall I see God,' print, 'Yet released from my flesh shall I see God'; the meaning of the Hebrew being 'out of' or 'apart from' my flesh, the exact opposite of that of the expression now used.

In the portion of Scripture usually read (I Cor. xv), delete the words 'at the last trump, for the trumpet shall sound,' and make verse 52 read as follows :—

'In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, for the dead are raised incorruptible and we shall be changed.'

In the concluding prayer delete the words, 'and that at the general Resurrection in the last day,' and print, 'and, rising again.'

I also suggest forms of prayer for the dead and also, what is most important, the introduction of a short form of service to be used at meetings for Psychic Communion, or the Communion of Saints.

CHARLES L. TWEEDALE.

WESTON VICARAGE, YORKS.
August 1, 1923.

P.S.—Since writing the above, the Editor of the Grey Book, to whom I have submitted these amendments, informs me that it is proposed to use many of them. Should they be finally incorporated into the Book of Common Prayer, a great advance will have been made.

SIR,

CHRISTIAN UNITY.

For the sake of accuracy, allow me to correct an error in the Dean of Worcester's address. In Scotland the Established and the Free Church have not come together. The latter is a small and extremely Calvinistic body, almost confined to the Celtic highlands, whose right to the title and property was declared by the House of Lords in 1904. It looks upon the present Establishment as full of unclean things.

The union now being negotiated is with the United Free Church, the largest Nonconformist body in Scotland. Both it and the Establishment may now be said to have practically dropped their Calvinism.

W. G. SCOTT MONCRIEFF.

Published on the 15th of the month.

Vol. XIII., No. 6. SEPTEMBER, 1923.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

CONTENTS

PAGE

The Earthquake in Japan 273
The Editor.

The Fourth Gospel and the Synoptists 278
A. T. W. Dowding, M.A.

The Church in its Relation to Religion 288
Miss M. D. Petre.

Moral Tales of the Hindus 294
Alban G. Widgery, M.A.

The Eye of Faith 299
E. W. Lummis, B.D.

Book Reviews:—
An English Socrates 309
Christ and Modernism 311
Fides Academica 313
An Unprofessional Ministry 315
A New Book on St. Paul 316
Quakerism in Two Centuries 319
Conditional Immortality 322

Correspondence 323
Prayer Book Revision; Late Rev. C. W. Emmet; Divorce: A Radical Reform (E. P. Boys-Smith); St. Paul and Women; Children's Lessons.

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

AGENTS: South Africa—T. Maskew Miller, Cape Town.
New Zealand—Walter Nash, 110–112 Lambton Quay, Wellington.

Price 1/- net. Annual Subscription, 10/6.

PROGRESS.

A CENTURY ago you would probably have purchased your Groceries by the glimmer of a smoky oil lamp in the front room of the shopkeeper's residence.

To-day we invite you to 'phone
"Oxford, Four"
and hey presto! our Motor Van will arrive at your door with the goods ordered.

GRIMBLY HUGHES & CO. LTD., THE CORNMARKET STORES, OXFORD.
Quality Grocers since 1840.

THE MITRE HOTEL, OXFORD.

THIS well-known Hotel for Families and Gentlemen, which is situate in the centre of the finest street in Europe, close to the Colleges, and within an easy distance of the river, has been enlarged and much improved. While the traditional antiquity of the building has been carefully preserved, visitors will find in it all the refined comforts of a MODERN HOTEL. The MITRE is largely patronized by distinguished English, American, and Continental Visitors and is recognised as one of the best first-class Hotels in the United Kingdom.

Dining, Drawing, Reading and Smoking Rooms, Lounge, Good Suites of Rooms, and Four Spacious Billiard Rooms.
Electric Light. A Night Porter in attendance.

Tariff on application to C. J. VERT, Manager. Telephone 335. Telegrams: 'Mitre,' Oxford.

HOOKHAM & COMPANY,

Clerical Outfits for Home or Colonial Wear.
Academical Robe Makers.

TAILORS, SHIRTMAKERS, HOSIERS, HATTERS.

3 CORNMARKET, OXFORD.

TAILORS SINCE 1846.

CASTELL & SON.

OUTFITTING ADDED IN 1873.

University and Clerical Tailors,
Robe Makers,
13 BROAD STREET, OXFORD.
(Opposite Balliol College).

Representatives of the Firm are frequently travelling, and appointments are respectfully solicited.